

ZIONISM

Enemy
of Peace and Social
Progress

Issue 4



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS - MOSCOW

ZIONISM-Enemy of Peace and Social Progress

Issue 4



Progress Publishers

Moscow

Translated from the Russian
Designed by *Vadim Kuleshov*
Miscellany compiled by *Eugeny Dmitriyev*

СИОНИЗМ — ПРОТИВНИК МИРА
И СОЦИАЛЬНОГО ПРОГРЕССА

На английском языке

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1985

English translation © Progress Publishers 1985

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

C 0804000000—546
014(01)—85 73—85

CONTENTS

The Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee Press Conference	5
An Interview with D. A. Dragunskii, the Chairman of the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee	26
A Meeting with Journalists in the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee on January 19th, 1984	30
<i>S. Rokotov.</i> Zionism in the Fight Against Socialism and Detente .	36
<i>Ye. Dmitriev.</i> The Middle East Settlement in the Context of Soviet-American Relations and the Activities of International Zionism	81
<i>L. Dadiani.</i> Zionist-Israeli Hegemonism: Past and Present . . .	97
<i>Yu. Sedov.</i> The Tragedy of Lebanon. The Plans and Deeds of the Zionist Aggressors	113
<i>I. Belyayev.</i> To Tel Aviv and Back	128
<i>A. Semioshkin.</i> Zionist Policies with Regard to Jerusalem . . .	138
<i>S. Tarasov.</i> The Goal Justifies the Means	155
<i>V. Olgin.</i> Contradictions Within International Zionism: Myth or Reality?	165
<i>I. Zvyagelskaya.</i> The Role of the Army and the Military in the Formation of the Bellicose Ideas of Zionism in the State of Israel	177

THE SOVIET ANTI-ZIONIST COMMITTEE PRESS CONFERENCE

On June 6th, 1983 the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee held a press conference in the press centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The following replied to questions from Soviet and foreign journalists: D. A. Dragunskii, the chairman of the committee, a colonel-general, twice Hero of the Soviet Union, head of the "Vystrel" (Shot) superior courses for officers, and member of the Central Auditing Commission of the CPSU; S. L. Zivs, first deputy chairman, D. Sc. (Law), a professor and merited science worker of the RSFSR; M. B. Krupkin, deputy chairman and Candidate of Science (Law); Yu. A. Kolesnikov, deputy chairman and member of the USSR Union of Writers; I. P. Belyaev, deputy chairman, head of a section of the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (Literary Gazette) and D. Sc. (Econ.); M. I. Kabachnik, a member of the presidium of the committee, academician, Hero of Socialist Labour and holder of the Lenin and State prizes; V. V. Pushkarev, a member of the presidium of the committee, grinder at the Moscow computer factory and deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet; and G. O. Zimanas, a member of the presidium of the committee, chief editor of the *Communistas* magazine and deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR. The press conference was conducted by V. M. Kamenev, deputy to the head of the press department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

We publish below the materials of this press conference.

D. A. Dragunskii: Dear comrades, ladies and gentlemen! Nearly one and a half months have passed since the constituent assembly established the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee and elected its members. One and a half month is, indeed, a short period, but

Soviet public opinion and the mass media have already shown great interest in our work and in the very fact that the Committee has been set up. A certain interest has also been provoked abroad by its establishment.

In this period we have received more than five hundred letters from Soviet citizens expressing ardent support for the initiative which has been shown. Quite a few letters came from abroad, and we have been approached by Soviet and foreign journalists. We therefore decided to meet with you today to tell you why and how our public organisation was founded, what its aims are, and its tasks. We shall also reply to any of your questions.

Everything began at the end of March and early April when a group of Soviet public figures made an appeal in the press for people to take an active part in the political unmasking of Zionism, strike a more decisive blow at the anti-Soviet propaganda of the Zionists, increase the effectiveness of our work, and to this end, to create the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee on a voluntary basis.

We appealed to workers, kolkhozniks, scientists, literary figures, artists, journalists—in fact to all the citizens of the various nationalities. We began receiving letters and telegrams literally the day after this appeal was published. It met with ardent support and, I would say, genuine enthusiasm. This all served as the basis for conducting the constituent assembly. We were able to state with complete amenability that we had been given a public mandate, and that public opinion was reflected in this widespread support. We had the right to call ourselves a public committee and to speak and appear in the name and on behalf of broad Soviet public opinion.

You may ask why we decided on the need to create the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee at this time. As early as at the beginning of the century Lenin was conducting the fight with Zionism. The Soviet people have always approached Zionism as they would an ideology concentrating in itself the apology of national exceptionalism and the “chosen people”, and, consequently, as they would a chauvinistic and racist ideology.

But there has now come a time when imperialism, and above all the reactionary circles of the USA, has begun to make ever more active and broad use of international Zionism for its own

purposes, which are dangerous for peace. It is well known that the international situation has deteriorated sharply. On Washington's initiative, modern anti-Communist crusaders are launching ever new attacks, and a big part in this global offensive against peace and progress is attributable to international Zionism and the ruling circles of Israel. The hypocritical, propagandistic and patently defamatory actions of the ideological and political adventurists from the ranks of international Zionism are all part of the West's "psychological war" against the Soviet Union.

The year which has passed has confirmed with particular clarity that, in its development, Zionism, its misanthropic ideology and practice is ever more obviously reproducing the ideas and methods of crushed Hitlerite fascism. The events in Lebanon showed the whole world that the crimes of Begin and his henchmen hardly differ from the atrocities perpetrated by the Hitlerites. All this prompted us to declare that the time had come to carry on a more organised fight against international Zionism and strike a blow at its anti-Soviet propaganda.

On that point I shall finish my short introduction. My colleagues and I are ready to answer your questions. Thank you for attention.

"Daily World" correspondent (USA): Zionists in the USA are trying to link criticism of Israel with anti-Semitism. In particular, their main target in this connection is the Soviet Union, and they are trying to portray the USSR as an anti-Semitic state. Would you comment on this, please?

D. A. Dragunskii: Such a device of Western, Zionist and pro-Zionist propaganda is typical of the system of misinformation and the slander against the Soviet Union. It is well known that the Soviet people decisively oppose any form of chauvinism or nationalism and such nationalistic quirks as anti-Semitism or Zionism.

The crimes of the Israeli military have aroused the indignation of honest people in all countries of the world—both Jews and non-Jews. There were even mass demonstrations in Israel itself. Are such protests also a manifestation of anti-Semitism?

Allegations that the establishment of the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee is a manifestation of some sort of anti-Jewish policy are absurd. The myth of the existence of a “Jewish question” in the USSR is in itself exploited in order to fortify the standard argument of the “eternalness of anti-Semitism” which, I would say, is one of the main supports of the ideology of Zionism.

Our committee opposes the clouding of peoples’ minds and the attempts to cultivate national prejudices in the consciousness of individuals. Our struggle is therefore being waged in order to protect people from the revolting influence of Zionist infection.

“Trud” (Labour) correspondent (USSR): How is the activity of the Anti-Zionist Committee financed?

M. B. Krupkin: The Committee is a public body and its finances will accordingly come from donations and subsidies from Soviet public organisations, scientific, artistic, cultural and educational establishments and associations, as well as from subscriptions from individuals.

“Izvestia” (News) correspondent (USSR): I would like to ask you to explain in more detail, why it is at present that the fight with Zionism is becoming particularly acute.

G. O Zimanas: The reactionary, aggressive line of Zionism is today to be seen more clearly and more distinctly than before. Zionism, which arose at the end of the last century as the ideology of the big Jewish bourgeoisie, has today become the official doctrine of Israel and determines its aggressive policies in the Middle East in the interests of American imperialism. The policy of Zionism—which is the real sponsor of the wars of aggression and the genocide in Sabra and Chatila—with its pathological hatred of everything Soviet, has inspired much loathing. The persistent and impudent claims of Zionist radio saboteurs, who provocatively allege that almost all the two million Soviet Jews dream of nothing other than emigrating to Israel, and that the remaining 269 million citizens of the Soviet Union “oppress” and “persecute” them, provoke the indignation of the Soviet people.

Any form of nationalism is harmful and dangerous, whether it is Zionism or anti-Semitism, German racism or the racist policies of the white minority in the Republic of South Africa. Any talk of the superiority of white, black and yellow people over all others is criminal, but it is particularly dangerous for humanity when it becomes the official ideology of a racist regime which draws on the support of international imperialism and achieves its aims by force of arms, spilling the blood of innocent people.

The Zionists do not like the fact that all Soviet citizens, including Soviet Jews love their Motherland and the Soviet system, which was attained in October 1917 and defended during the Great Patriotic War at the price of the lives of 20 million of the sons and daughters of our peoples. They hate the Soviet Union, which hinders the implementation of their plans, and it is here that we find the reason for the incompatibility of Zionism with Soviet patriotism and the internationalism of Soviet citizens.

“Golos Rodiny” (Voice of the Motherland) correspondent (USSR): What can you say about the fall in the number of Jews emigrating from the USSR?

“Los Angeles Times” correspondent (USA): Do you consider the desire of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel or some other country equivalent to treachery? If so, why?

S. L. Zivs: I will try to answer both these questions together. You see, comrades, ladies and gentlemen, we have for a long time been coming across the juggling of figures which is widely resorted to by Zionist propaganda. One minute they declare that 50,000 want to leave the Soviet Union, the next they say 700,000. Not long ago I saw the figure of 383,528 in a book and remembered it. The question naturally arises of where these figures come from? They are not taken from a real number of people who are applying or have applied to leave, but from figures planned by the Zionist, if one may say so, demographers. Let us say they send out a hundred thousand summonses—it will soon be declared that a hundred thousand people wish to leave. How is this done? Summonses on the pre-

text of "uniting a family" are sent to people who have never had relatives in Israel, and still do not. They are sometimes even sent to Soviet citizens who do not even exist, or one person may receive several. In literally the few weeks our Committee has been in the existence Soviet citizens have sent us letters full of indignation and enclosing such "official" summonses. But in what respect are they official? They bear a red notary's stamp and an accompanying letter from the Israel Foreign Ministry which talks of a humane attitude to the question of reunification and even refers to relatives who do not exist. That is one side of the affair.

Another aspect is that we are well aware that of late, this year, and in the previous one, there has been a significant fall in the number of people leaving. I stress: a fall in the number of people applying to leave.

For a number of years after the war, the main motive prompting Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality to emigrate was that of reunification. You know that many Jewish families were split up during the war, and this has served as a basis for reunification applications. Reunification, however, has, on the whole, been completed, and the number of people leaving is therefore naturally falling.

But I believe that, apart from that, the number of people is constantly decreasing who give in to the Zionist enticements, become victims of Zionist propaganda and leave our country.

This is when slander begins to be introduced into Western pro-Zionist propaganda, as though the Soviet authorities are restricting exit from the country or suspending it. Someone even tried to link the significant drop in the number of people leaving with the creation of our Committee. I should add that the question of emigration is decided by competent state organs. Our Committee, of course, can only elucidate and help Soviet citizens to understand the mendacity and maliciousness of Zionist propaganda and try to protect them from it.

I am talking about this particularly in connection with the fact that our Committee has already begun receiving letters full of anxiety, bitterness and despair from former Soviet citizens living abroad.

I think it is worth quoting some of these letters. This is a letter we received from Lyubov Winkler, a former Soviet citi-

zen now living in West Berlin: "To my deeply respected and dear comrades who initiated the creation of the Anti-Zionist Committee! It was with great satisfaction that I read your appeal in the *Pravda*. I congratulate you on the establishment of your Committee and hope you are successful in your work... I am a victim of Zionist propaganda, and for eleven years have been suffering beyond the frontiers of my beloved and only Soviet Motherland... I am now 59 years old, a doctor... I have seen a lot and had a hard time both in Israel and here... I have seen the brutal face of Zionism... Grief and tears, suffering, humiliation, complete isolation and loneliness in a loathsome, alien world. What has happened to me is the result of tricky Zionist propaganda. The Zionists interfered in my life and ruined it."

On the next letter, which is from Brooklyn, New York, you can see numerous postmarks. The letter reads: "Having given in to Zionist propaganda, we took a suicidal step... We were simply idiots, leaving our only Motherland without knowing what we were in for." I will not read you all of this letter because it contains many bitter, very bitter pages. "We are extremely unhappy, we are in the very depths of hell"—these are the sort of words used in this letter, which is signed on behalf of several families. The writers express their certainty that "the Anti-Zionist Committee will defend Soviet Jews from the intrigues of Zionism and imperialism in general, and work in all fairness not to let people go, condemning them to misery."

You see, the question is one of permission to leave the Soviet Union being a condemnation of people to misery.

In this note I have here with the second question, the word "treachery" is underlined. I think you have understood from my answer that when a family is reunited, when a father is, indeed, reunited with the children from whom he was separated during the war, then there is no treachery.

But when a person has fallen into the trap of Zionist propaganda, I would say as a lawyer that this is an unpatriotic deed which does not correspond to our moral principles or meet with the support of Soviet society or an absolute majority of Jewish citizens of our country.

"*Sovetskaya Rossiya*" (*Soviet Russia*) correspondent: Do rep-

resentatives of the various nationalities take part in the Anti-Zionist Committee's work?

V. V. Pushkarev: There was a call to citizens of the various nationalities to take part in the Committee's work in the appeal to the Soviet public, and many people responded to it. The constituent assembly elected Russians, Jews, Ukrainians and representatives of other nationalities to the Committee. It is the international duty of all good-will people to unmask Zionism, its ideology of nationalism and chauvinism, and the practice of robbery and genocide of Israel's ruling circles in the Middle East.

The following make up the Anti-Zionist Committee: M. I. Kabachnik and T. I. Oizerman, who are prominent scientists and academicians of our country, and V. N. Kudryavtsev, who is a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; the prominent cultural figures of M. I. Blanter and A. O. Stepanova, who are both People's Artists of the USSR and both hold the Hero of Socialist Labour title; T. M. Lioznova, who is a film director and holds the State prize; representatives of labour collectives from Moscow and the surrounding area—Hero of Socialist Labour A. K. Marinich, the chairman of the "22nd Congress of the CPSU" collective farm in the Kolomensky region and Hero of Socialist Labour G. P. Golubeva, a poultry farmer at the Bratsevskii poultry combine. The famous writers H. Hoffman, Ts. Solodar, and Yu. Kolesnikov, and the poets A. Vergelis and A. Dementyev are also members of the Committee.

Radio Peace and Progress correspondent (USSR): The allegation of discrimination against Soviet Jews in education and science was one of the recurrent themes at the provocative gathering "in defence of Soviet Jews" that took place in March of this year in Jerusalem. What can you say in this connection?

M. I. Kabachnik: Zionist propaganda is invariably notable for its brazeness and has not stopped at its flagrant juggling of facts. I would begin by pointing out that here in the Soviet Union we have a system of general secondary education which is obligatory for all children, irrespective of their nationality, sex or material position. All children, including Jews, receive an education. This means that there cannot possibly be any discrimination in this field. If we move on to the next stages of

education, that is, to secondary technical and higher education, what discrimination are we talking about if Soviet Jews hold one of the highest places in the Soviet Union amongst other nationalities in terms of their level of education? Further, we can boldly assert that in such terms Soviet Jews stand above those in all other countries.

Let us take the highest level. There is among the prominent Soviet scientists a significant number of Jews who have been elected to the Academy of Sciences, the country's highest scientific body. And it has been like that throughout the years of Soviet power. I remember how A. F. Yoffe, an outstanding physicist and head of the Soviet School of Physics, was chosen as an academic in 1920, and soon after that A. N. Frumkin, the head of the Soviet school of electrochemistry and a brilliant scientist whose name was known around the world, was also elected, as well as a whole host of others. I can list a great number of postwar names—for instance, the physicist V. L. Ginzburg, the crystallographer B. K. Vainstein, the physicist I. M. Frank and his biophysicist brother G. M. Frank, the biochemist A. S. Braunstein, and the physicist A. B. Migdal. I could continue this list. Apart from that the academicians Ya. B. Zeldovich and Yu. B. Khariton have each three times been awarded the Hero of Socialist Labour title. And Zionist propaganda calls all this discrimination! This also applies to professors and lecturers in higher educational establishments and technical colleges. Thus, talk of discrimination against Jews in education is, to put it bluntly, a provocative invention of Zionist propaganda.

Cable News Network correspondent (USA): The state of Israel has a right to exist. Any government which practices policies similar to those of the Nazis must not have this right. Will your Committee call on the Soviet government to change its policy towards the state of Israel or will you call on the government to support those elements in the Arab world which believe that the state of Israel should not exist?

S. L. Zivs: If I have correctly understood your question, it looks like this: we are talking today about the fact that the Israeli government is adopting the very methods which were

used by the Nazis. Moreover, the official opinion of the Soviet government, which is repeatedly expressed, is that the state of Israel does have the right to exist, but that, if it is a Nazi state, it does not enjoy this right. Have I understood you correctly? However, let us split up the two parts of the question. Ever since the creation of the state of Israel, A. A. Gromyko, the USSR Minister for Foreign Affairs, has stressed the official point of view of the Soviet government from the tribune of the UN and very recently at a press conference held in this building. This point of view is upheld by the whole of Soviet public opinion. Yes, the state of Israel does have the right to exist.

We are also talking about the fact that the ruling circles of Israel and the Israeli military have committed and are continuing to commit the same crimes as were committed by the Nazis in their time. This is particularly borne out by the barbaric aggression against Lebanon. Is there really no coincidence between the methods and devices now being used by the Begin government and those of the Nazis who tried to obtain Lebensraum for themselves?

The international commissions comprising the bishop of Stockholm, Queen's Counsel John Platts-Mills from Britain, and the Belgian professor Paulette Pierson-Mathy, which repeatedly carried out investigations, came to the conclusion that the crimes of the Israeli military are analogous with those of the Nazis. The question also repeatedly arose of the accountability of those who inspired and those who committed these crimes.

We are not talking about the dissolution of Israel, but about the accountability of its ruling circles and the cessation of its aggressive, expansionist policy, which is threatening peace in the Middle East and runs contrary to the interests of Israelis themselves.

I. P. Belyaev: In your question you make it sound as though the Soviet Union supports Israel's right to exist in words only, and that in practice it supports those Arab circles which oppose the existence of the state of Israel. This is not true. It was at the very same press conference and in the very same declaration that A. A. Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union does

not support those extremist Arab circles which oppose the existence of the Israeli state.

Radio Moscow correspondent: Will the letters which the Anti-Zionist Committee has received be published?

M. B. Krupkin: We have received a large quantity of letters, some of which were printed in *Izvestia* a few days ago. We have included some of the comments—and I emphasise only a small part of them—in a pamphlet entitled *The Soviet People Offer Their Support*.

UPI correspondent (USA): What can you say about the current role of the Jewish Autonomous Region and its centre Birobidzhan?

I. P. Belyaev: We can speak about the successful creation and development of the Jewish Autonomous Region in the Khabarovsk Territory in the Eastern part of the Soviet Union. It will be useful for the participants in the press conference to know that, in the nearly half century of its existence, not one person of Jewish nationality has emigrated from here to Israel.

G. O. Zimanas: I was in the Jewish Autonomous Region with a group of colleagues not very long ago. The main impression I formed was of the attitude of friendship and brotherhood between the Jews and the non-Jews. The first secretary of the Regional Party Committee is a Jew by nationality, as are the directors of many enterprises. The notices in all official establishments are in both Russian and Yiddish.

The population of the region forms a unified family, and the region can be proud not only of economic successes, but also of achievements in the sphere of culture. It has a Jewish theatre which often tours other towns of the Soviet Union, including Moscow.

Danish TV correspondent: As I understand, you maintain that anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism are two different concepts, but do you deny that anti-Zionism can be used as a convenient cover for anti-Semitism?

S. L. Zivs: In the course of today's conference we have already repeated, and we are ready to repeat time and again that all Soviet people and the whole of Soviet society decisively and categorically oppose chauvinism, nationalism, and any national quirks, both anti-Semitism and Zionism. You know perfectly well that Zionist propaganda will try to declare any speech against both the ideology and political practice of Zionism as anti-Semitism.

"Komsomolskaya Pravda" correspondent (USSR): In connection with some of the details which have surfaced from the case of the Hitlerite butcher Klaus Barbie, I would like to know if you know of any facts linking the Nazi criminals and the Zionists.

Yu. A. Kolesnikov: Of, course. I shall tell you about them. I managed to get deep behind the German lines, where I had been sent by the Soviet command. I saw what was going on on the territory occupied by the Nazis.

Adolf Hitler had given his SS Gruppenführers and Gauleiters, his generals and other butchers an extremely laconic but capacious directive: just one Jew was to remain—but only as an exhibit. It should be pointed out that the Nazi butchers precisely, methodically and scrupulously fulfilled this diabolical order of their Führer's.

I want at this point to observe that throughout the war the Soviet command gave priority attention to saving people of any nationality and denomination, including Jews, from the destruction threatening them in fascist captivity. Our courageous underground fighters and partisans saved miserable people, hid them in safe places, or led them into the woods, often paying for this with their lives.

And, in that unbelievably difficult time, when honest people the world over wondered how to quicken victory over the "brown plague" and save humanity from Nazism, the leaders of international Zionism, who had conferred on themselves the right to be called the "defenders of Jews", were, in fact, by no means engaged in the defence of Jews. They were not worried about the fate of their fellow-tribesmen languishing and dying in Hitler's death camps. The bosses of Zionism were preoccu-

pied only with the numerical preponderance of Jews over the Arab population of Palestine. And this was at a time when it was already well known how Nazism was "solving the Jewish problem". That is why the actions of the leaders of international Zionism are nailed to the shameful pillar of the history of the Second World War.

These are the reasons why we are today justified in returning such a harsh and severe verdict on Zionism. And this will be absolutely correct, perfectly objective, and unconditionally fair, for at that terrible time, international Zionist figures not only did not defend Jews but, on the contrary, they betrayed them, striking bargains with the chiefs of the Gestapo and the SS.

The "Palestinian office", which used to operate in Berlin, the capital of the Third Reich, is evidence of this. This office was headed by Levi Eshkol, one of the leaders of international Zionism and who subsequently became Prime Minister of Israel.

It was Eshkol and his myrmidons who were engaged in saving the rich Jews who had been of "particular service" to Zionism from the SS bosses. A wealth of facts is known of how Eshkol's office even refused help to rich Jews simply because they did not share the Zionists' point of view. Thus, these people, like many tens, hundreds of thousands of Jews and non-Jews were doomed to certain death in Hitler's incinerators.

Moreover, the "Palestinian office" co-operated directly with the head of the Fourth department of the Reich Security Head Office and the notorious Obersturmbannführer of the SS, Adolf Eichmann. This co-operation brought both sides considerable "fruits". In connection with this it is appropriate to remember the noisy case of Rudolf Kastner, well-known in Israel and beyond its frontiers in its time. This Zionist emissary of the "Action Committee" with "extensive authority" had not only "business" but also, I would say, warm relations with Adolf Eichmann.

It was not by accident that after the Second World War the Zionist sleuths were eager to trace the former Obersturmbannführer so that, God forbid, he should not be caught by representatives of some other country and the concealed secrets of the Zionists' alliance with the Nazis become the property of the whole of world public opinion.

Incidentally, something of the sort was about to happen. The exterminated people of various nationalities from many countries, including Soviet citizens, and, of course, prisoners of war murdered in the Nazi camps are all on the conscience of this Hitlerite butcher.

It is also typical that the Israeli rulers have not, as yet, added their voice to the demands for the extradition and punishment of Nazi criminals who have found refuge in the United States of America.

It's like a proverbial saying—tell me who you're defending, and I'll know who you are.

I think it is clear to everyone who is who. The facts I have cited are far from a complete answer to the question but I think we shall have another opportunity to continue this conversation.

Novosti Press Agency (APN) correspondent: Do Zionist doctrines influence Israeli foreign policy?

I. P. Belyaev: Undoubtedly, they do. In fact, they not only influence it, they determine it. I would remind you that Israel has existed for a little over 37 years and that in this truly short historical period, the Israeli state has been at war six times!

Here it is precisely Zionist doctrines—including the doctrine of Greater Israel from the Nile to the Euphrates—which play the decisive role in determining Israel's policy, both in the occupied Arab territories, and in relation to their neighbours.

The theory has begun to be circulated about a Jewish homeland which existed in ancient times and which it is now essential to resurrect, this theory also speaks about the "historic right" by which the West Bank and the Gaza Strip were declared "liberated areas" and a whole people—the Palestinian Arabs—was denied national legal rights. All this had one single purpose—to justify the annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Begin thinks it is only a matter of time.

And if we are to talk of other Zionist theories, their main point is that the map of the Middle East must be redrawn, meaning that Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and even Egypt should be divided up into small formations. Begin and his government also oppose defining the state frontiers of Israel, saying that they do

not naturally exist. According to the plan of a "Greater Israel", the frontiers must be movable and be established subject to further territorial expansion.

Our Committee's declaration concerning the Lebanese-Israeli agreement was published in the press on May 17th. It stressed the crushing terms of the agreement which was foisted on Lebanon by Israel and the USA. In our opinion, this agreement is nothing more than a smoke screen set up to hide the true goals of Israeli policy. We are talking of preparation for a new war against the Arabs.

"Al-Watan" correspondent (Kuwait): What is your attitude to the just struggle of the Palestinian Arabs under the guidance of the PLO for the creation of a democratic Palestinian Arab state? My second question is, how do you view Ronald Reagan's so-called peace plan?

I. P. Belyaev: I don't think there is any need to give a verbose reply to the first question. The Soviet Union has always supported the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their national rights and the creation of a Palestinian Arab state. We have always believed that the United Nations resolution adopted on November 29th, 1947 constitutes the legal basis for the creation of such a state. This resolution established the need to partition the previously mandated territory of Palestine into two states—an Arab one, which was indicated in the first line, and a Jewish one. The Jewish state appeared on May 14th, 1948, but the Palestinian Arab state was never created. It does not follow from this, however, that the Palestinian Arabs have lost their right to it. We have active relations with the PLO. The principal position of the USSR is set out in the corresponding documents, and we regard the PLO as the sole legal representative of the Palestinian people.

As for the second question, the Reagan peace plan, as is well known, refers to some association of the West Bank with Jordan, but the plan itself does not explain what sort of association this is to be and the cardinal problem of the Middle East conflict—that of the Palestinians—is circumvented. And, as it seems to me, this plan, which was advanced on September

1st last year at the height of the war in Lebanon, pursued the end of diverting attention from the aggression and crimes of Israel in Lebanon, and in no way sought a comprehensive and just regulation of the conflict. As for the "strategic agreement" between the United States and Israel, this is the actual union, on the basis of which Israel and the United States in essence jointly made war in Lebanon and are now preparing for a new war against Syria.

"Daily World" correspondent: General Dragunskii! You know from personal experience what role was played by Soviet Jews in the Great Patriotic War and the role of the Soviet Army in saving millions of Jews from death in the gas chambers. Please tell us about this.

D. A. Dragunskii: Jews fought in the united multinational Red Army against Hitler's hordes. Around 200,000 Jews fell bravely at the fronts of the war, and the heroic military feats of many thousands of Jewish warriors have been recognised by the conferment of medals. More than 120 people are worthy of a title of Hero of the Soviet Union. People in the Soviet Union faithfully honour the heroic military deeds performed in the years of the Great Patriotic War.

I myself entered the war in the Osovets fortress, and I saw many fronts during its 1418 gruelling days and nights. There were representatives of about 30 nationalities in the brigade I commanded at the end of the war, and they were all fighting for our Motherland. They didn't ask who you were—a Russian, a Kazakh, Jew or Lett. They had one task—quickly to do away with racism and fascism, and win freedom for our Motherland. We fought and gained victory as a united multinational family of the Soviet peoples.

I would also like to remind you that every year on May 9th, we celebrate Victory Day. This day is officially celebrated in many countries—but not in Israel.

In Israel, such a great historic event as the victory over Nazi Germany, the routing of fascism, is not celebrated as a state holiday. The pathological hatred of the Zionist bosses for the Soviet Union prevents them from recognising the worldwide and historic contribution of the USSR to the achievement of Vic-

tory, which averted the realisation of the Nazis' barbaric plans to exterminate all so-called "lower races", including the Jews.

"Zo Haderech" (the organ of the Communist Party of Israel) correspondent: How does the Committee plan to work and will it announce a concrete programme? Secondly, I know that Comrade Belyaev recently returned from Israel, where he attended Victory Day celebrations. Perhaps he will say a few words for us.

M. B. Krupkin: I shall answer the first question. A few days ago the Presidium of the Committee approved a plan of work which above all envisages various measures aimed at the exposure of Zionism and the devices of imperialism. This plan takes into account various suggestions contained in letters received by the Committee.

I. P. Belyaev: It was in a small delegation of just three people that I took part in the celebrations in Israel of the 38th anniversary of Victory over Nazi Germany. I would like immediately to stress that this was not an official event. It was organised by the progressive forces of Israel and, incidentally, has become traditional in that country.

Despite the official position of the ruling circles, more than 10,000 people gathered in the Red Army wood near Jerusalem. The first part of the holiday is the laying of flowers at a modest memorial to those who fell in the Second World War, and the second part is a solemn meeting. This holiday was a witness to the fact that there are forces in Israel which hold that people must keep in their memory the tragic events of the war and should never allow new military conflicts in current conditions. This holiday was a protest against both the war with Lebanon and against the plans to unleash a war with Syria, about which official Israel was already talking very loudly at that time.

To touch on the speeches made at that meeting, I would say that the most significant thing was probably that in all of them the idea was pierced that crimes like those perpetrated by the Nazi in the Second World War must not be repeated. It was also very interesting for me to observe that both Jews and Arabs

took part in the meeting. It seems to me that this celebration was also a demonstration that Jews and Arabs in the Middle East can live peacefully together.

This was a meeting aimed against the doctrines which today are nourishing those in Israel who favour a new war with Syria, attacking Jordan, and redrawing the political map of the Middle East.

Radio Moscow correspondent: Zionist propaganda is trying to convince its Western audience that citizens of Jewish nationality are being encrouched upon in the Soviet Union. Please comment on this.

S. L. Zivs: The attempt to stir up the “Jewish question” in the USSR is an element of the “psychological war” against our country. In connection with this, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Western press is systematically deluged with slander about discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union. Books regularly come out which are specially dedicated to this question. Here I have two such books which were published in France. One is called *Anti-Semitism in Russia from Its Sources to Our Days*, and the other *To Be a Jew in the U.S.S.R.* Both were released by the prestigious and, I would say, academic University Press publishing house.

If you turn through the pages of *To Be a Jew in the U.S.S.R.*, you can find figures, tables, calculations and footnotes but not the truth. Let us turn to, say, page 86. It speaks of how the teaching of religion to very young children is punishable even with the death sentence, in accordance with Article 119 of the Criminal Code. See for yourselves what Article 119 of the RSFSR Criminal Code says. It speaks of the punishment for having sexual intercourse with juveniles.

Let us look further. Here it speaks of how the *Collected Works* by V. I. Lenin were republished in 1964 and that his 1919 speech aimed against anti-Semitism was not included because of the wish not to remind people of this. But take the 38th volume of the *Collected Works* by V. I. Lenin, and read the text of this speech. In it he explains who is kindling hostility to the Jews—the capitalists of all countries, who are interested in diverting the attention of the workers of all nationalities from their real enemies in this way.

Here are a few more examples. The author claims that all plays running in Moscow theatres have an anti-Semitic direction. Here, references are given. I think that even the foreign journalists have seen the production of Mikhail Bulgakov's play *The Race*, which has even been made into a film. This dramatic work, which paints a broad picture of the retreat of the routed White Guard bands from the Crimea and their flight to Constantinople, is declared anti-Semitic on the grounds that the insignificant character of Artur Arturovich, the cockroach king, organises cockroach races in Constantinople and it is possible to judge from one of the comments that he is a Jew.

In this same book we read that for more than half a century, not one single edition has come out in the USSR of the Bible in Hebrew. In fact, this it is, published in 1979, the Old Testament—the Five Books of Moses, in Hebrew and with a parallel Russian text. It was published by the Religious Society of the Moscow Choral Synagogue.

“Neues Leben” correspondent: The allegation often appears in the Western press that in the Soviet Union the teaching of Hebrew is forbidden. At the same time Hebrew is called the national language of Jews in the USSR. What is the actual situation?

G. O. Zimanas: Hebrew was never the national language of people of Jewish nationality, neither in Tsarist Russia, nor in the Soviet Union. That language was Yiddish. At present, around 14 per cent of Jews in the Soviet Union consider Yiddish their mother tongue. As for Hebrew, which in Israel has been resurrected and adapted to modern conditions, this language is taught in Soviet higher education establishments where specialists such as philologists and orientalists are trained. For instance, in the Asian and African Institute at the Moscow State University, and the Tbilisi and Leningrad universities.

I will not dwell on the fact that the Zionist leaders are banking heavily on the introduction of Hebrew. They would like to see Hebrew taught and adopted as a common language for the unified “world Jewish nation” which they promote. Hebrew also appears to the leaders of Zionism as an instru-

ment which must simplify the spreading of Zionist ideology.

But let us return to Yiddish. I can assert with all responsibility that the Zionist impostors—the “defenders of Soviet Jewish culture”—are absolutely indifferent to the language of Yiddish, the national language of Soviet Jews. Tell me the name of any Western publishing house which would be ready to publish books by Soviet Jewish writers writing in Yiddish, or even an anthology of works printed in Yiddish in the magazine *Sovetish Heimland*, which comes out in Moscow. Tell me the name of a Western recording company which is ready to release records of Yiddish songs by Yosif Kobzon or Galina Kareva. Name any leading Western newspaper from *Le Monde* to *The New York Times* which would write about the beautiful Yiddish primer which has been approved by the education department of the Jewish Autonomous Region and published by the Khabarovsk publishing house in 1982.

Why is all this passed over in silence? Because one has only to write about this for the real meaning of the “defence of Jewish culture in the USSR” to become absolutely clear to any person in the West.

“La Revue des relations internationales” correspondent (Belgium): In Belgium there are Jewish figures, particularly among university teachers, who take part in the unmasking of Israel and Zionism. Of course, they work under extremely hard conditions and are under the pressure of Zionist propaganda. My question is this: does your Committee envisage co-operation with Jewish figures of anti-Zionist persuasion in other countries?

S. L. Zivs: I think that, in the course of its future work our Committee will establish links with foreign national and international organisations which support the exposure of Zionism and its ideology and political practice.

Editor of “Politiken” (Denmark): You assert that you and your Committee support the existence of the state of Israel, but it is known that the ideological basis of the Israeli state is Zionism. How can one fight Zionism and, at the same time, defend the existence of the state of Israel?

S. L. Zivs: I think you know our fundamental position perfectly well: we are in favour of developing normal relations with states where the ruling circles and dominant parties hold ideological positions which are unacceptable to us. But I would not like to say that we are at the present time ready to extend such an approach to Israel, for its government holds positions of military adventurism, aggression, racism and expansion.

“Moscow News” correspondent: A tendency has recently been noticed for immigration to the “Promised Land” to fall. In Israel itself, a growth in the desire to emigrate is being observed. Does this not bear witness to the crisis of Zionism?

S. L. Zivs: I think we could talk not only of the crisis of Zionism, but rather of the downfall of one of its main conceptions—“the gathering in the land of Israel of all the world’s Jews”. What is happening in practice? In all the years of its existence, roughly one and a half million people have moved permanently to this state from around the world. And roughly 600,000, i.e., one third, have left it, simply fled. What is this, if it is not a new “exodus”!

The incredible growth of inflation is also one of the reasons prompting people to leave Israel. It stood at 135 per cent last year, a sort of record for capitalist countries. Other reasons include the atmosphere of chauvinistic intoxication, the pressure of religious circles and, finally, the state of permanent war, when not one family knows which of its members will be lost during the next aggression. The Israeli parliament is at present discussing the question of sanctions against those who try to leave the country. I think this speaks more eloquently than any words about the Zionist myth, which has now crushed.

**AN INTERVIEW WITH
D. A. DRAGUNSKII,
THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
SOVIET ANTI-ZIONIST
COMMITTEE, PUBLISHED IN
THE SOVETS KAYA
KULTURA
(SOVIET CULTURE) NEWSPAPER
ON JUNE 21st, 1983**

The creation of the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee provoked the usual fit of anti-Soviet hysteria in Washington. Setting the tone of this slanderous campaign, Ronald Reagan, the US Department of State and some congressmen made flagrant attacks on the Soviet Union and clumsy attempts to pervert the essence of Lenin's nationalities policy of the CPSU. They are trying to present the criticism of Zionism and the discussion by the Soviet public of Israel's aggressive policy as an "anti-Semitic campaign" in the USSR. A TASS correspondent asked Colonel-General D. A. Dragunskii, the chairman of the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee and twice Hero of the Soviet Union to state his opinion concerning the reaction of official Washington to the Committee's creation and its activity. Here is his reply.

Behind the malicious, surely following attacks from Washington it is not difficult to discern the extreme irritation which has gripped the Zionist camp and its patrons. After all, our Committee, reflecting the will of the Soviet people, has set as its goal the all-round unmasking of the reactionary essence of Zionism, which concentrates in itself nationalist extremism, chauvinism and national intransigence, and embodies the cult of political adventurism and the permissibility of doing everything, unrestrained demagogic and insolent sabotages, dirty manoeuvres and rare perfidy. It is by no means accidental that imperialism, headed by the USA, makes broad use of international Zionism as one of its strike detachments in its global strategy of attacks of socialism and the national liberation movement, and the forces of peace and social progress. This is why the setting-up of our fight with Zionism, its reactionary ideology and criminal practice provokes such obvious bitterness

in imperialism's most aggressive circles, not to mention amongst the Zionist bosses.

It is typical that the conductors of the bourgeois propaganda orchestra are unable to think of anything new and merely repeat their own stock phrases, while keeping completely silent about the genuine motives for creating our Committee and its aims, which have been widely publicised in the Soviet and much of the foreign press. Thus, A. Romberg, the official representative of the Department of State, groundlessly accused the Soviet Union of "anti-Semitism". But the ideology of Zionism and its advocates have resorted to such a dishonest device throughout the history of international Zionism, which in no way increases its persuasiveness.

The attempts of the Zionist bosses and their Washington benefactors in the current administration to confer on themselves the right to take the role of self-styled "defenders" of Soviet Jews provoke the deep indignation of the Soviet people. They resort to the most frenzied slander of our Soviet Motherland, its history and present-day life, presently adulterating the nationalities policy of the Leninist party. The thousands of letters which we receive from all corners of the country are full of this indignation.

The Soviet people—and this is proved by the entire history of our multinational socialist state—are genuine internationalists, and any forms of chauvinism are deeply alien to them, including Zionism and anti-Semitism. Of course, these principles also lie at the basis of our Committee's work.

The Zionists are drawing their "arguments", if they may be called that and which are calculated to deceive the world public, from libels poisoned with the slander by all kinds of renegades maintained by the American and Israeli special services. And, of course, genuine and widely available facts do not suit them, such as, for example, the fact that in the Soviet Union, where Jews form 0.67 per cent of the population, there are more Jewish students studying in higher educational establishments than there are in Israel. Thousands of Jews have been elected as deputies to Soviets and, just as people of other nationalities, they occupy many responsible posts.

However, the overseas slanderers have already been caught out more than once and we can only be surprised that in their

strive for political dividends, high-ranking figures in the current Washington administration time and again turn over the old, worn-out record. Especially as if they are genuinely worried about the "position of Jews", the grounds for this worry could also be found in abundance and without difficulty not at the other end of the world, but at home: there are more than enough facts showing that arrant anti-Semitism is flourishing in the United States itself. Indeed, it is flourishing doubly under the complete tolerance of the authorities. Discrimination in employment, the existence of clubs to which Jews are barred entry, the burning and bombing of synagogues, the defilement of Jewish cemeteries, the daubing of swastikas on houses where Jews live, and the bashing of teenagers—all this has become the everyday way of life in America. As the newspaper *U.S.A. Today* testifies, the number of anti-Semitic demonstrations aimed against both individual citizens and Jewish organisations, has grown more than eightfold in the USA in the last three years. Last year, 947 such incidents were recorded. Things reached a point where even schoolchildren in Massachusetts formed an "organisation of Americans who hate Negroes and Jews". Whoever gave the right to the authorities of a country permitting such savagery to take the role of moralists and preach to others how they should observe "human rights"?

I would like to point out that particular irritation was provoked in the US State Department by the materials which were presented by our Committee at a recent press conference and corroborated the fact that the chauvinistic ideology of modern international Zionism and the criminal political practice of the ruling circles of Israel in point of fact constitute a repetition of the racist ideas and misanthropic acts of Nazis. Mr. Romberg considers such a parallel an extraordinary perversion of history and the truth.

Pausing on the conscience of the representative of the US foreign policy department his knowledge of history and opinion of the truth, I want to recall a well-known fact that someone in Washington would evidently like to remove from the memory of mankind. The evil deeds perpetrated by the Israeli military in Lebanon, which to this day continue in the occupied Arab lands and for which the Tel Aviv rulers and the leaders of international Zionism bear direct responsibility, have provoked an explo-

sion of indignation and vexation the world over. The Prime Minister of Greece, Andreas Papandréou, called Israel a fascist state, and the London magazine *Middle East International* believes the Israeli regime to be akin to the dictatorial fascist regimes in Latin America.

It is well known that voices are being heard ever more often in Israel itself which condemn the adventurist policy of the Israeli government. In reply to this, the persecution of democratic forces is becoming increasingly severe and merciless. The growth of progressive, democratic moods frightens Washington and Tel Aviv, as does the protest movement against the expansionist rulers of Israel. It is precisely for this reason that the overseas politicians are also trying to conceal the adventurism of Zionism and its roguish practice of attacking our Committee.

But, just as you cannot sew a skull-cap from a pig's tail, to use an expression of Sholem Aleichem, classic of Jewish literature, so the Washington advocates who protect Zionism cannot hide its repulsive face by any exercises in libel.

A MEETING WITH JOURNALISTS IN THE SOVIET ANTI-ZIONIST COMMITTEE ON JANUARY 19th, 1984

S. Zivs: This meeting is dedicated to acquainting journalists with Soviet and foreign publications exposing Israel's crimes against the Lebanese and the Palestinian Arabs, and, in the final analysis, crimes committed by the unbridled Zionists against Israeli citizens themselves.

D. Dragunskii: The world public, including the Soviet people, is extremely worried by the planet's hot spots. One of these is the Middle East, which is ever more often being called the "Balkans of the Third World War". American imperialism is trying to establish its rule here by fire and sword, and it is precisely with this aim that Washington actively makes use of the aggressiveness and expansionism of its strategic ally, Israel, allotting it the role of a battering ram to be used against the Arab national liberation movement. When it invaded Lebanon in the summer of 1982, the Israeli Zionist leadership openly declared its fundamental goal as being to smash the Palestinian resistance movement and physically destroy its military formations.

Today, Israel's "longest" war in Lebanon continues. The USA took an active part both in its preparation and in the war itself. This is an obvious fact, which does not need any proof. Washington and Tel Aviv are working hand in hand, and in recent weeks the situation in the Middle East has become even more explosive. Israel is developing plans for an aggression against Syria, and is not hiding its intention to annex the south of Lebanon.

During the invasion of Lebanon the Israeli military used and today continues to use barbaric weapons which it obtained in plentiful supply from the USA before the offensive. It is suf-

ficient to mention the explosive devices which looked like toys. Even the Hitlerite fanatics did not think up such things. They were a barbaric "innovation" of Tel Aviv's, whose victims were children, old men, and women. Actually, Israel is at war with the civilian Lebanese and Palestinian Arab population.

The path of the aggressor in Lebanon is strewn with corpses. We only have to recall the Israeli artillery's bombardment of West Beirut, the bloody slaughterhouse created by the aggressor and his assistants in the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Chatila, and the Israeli air force's very recent bombing of Baalbek, which is a historical monument.

I especially want to stress that the crimes of Israel in Lebanon have been perpetrated in conditions of a worsening of the worldwide situation such as have never been seen in the postwar period. In reply to a letter from the French anti-war movement Appeal of 100, Yuri Andropov justly emphasised that "the USA and those of its NATO partners which supported the deployment of new American missiles on European soil . . . bear full responsibility for the situation which has taken shape".

S. Zivs: The American-Israeli aggression against Lebanon is a crime. There is a criminal—the Zionist leadership of Israel. There is also an accomplice to the crime—American imperialism, which takes the role of inspirer, organiser and executor. We can assert with full amenability that this is a crime against humanity.

When the truth became known about what the aggressor was doing in Lebanon the world was horrified. The Second World War nightmares were revived in people's memories of Khatyn, Oradour, Treblinka, Oswiecim, and Buchenwald. The world public reacted indignantly.

Several international commissions were set up to investigate the crimes of the Israeli army in Lebanon, and accounts and materials of the commissions' hearings on the work they did have been published. You have before you materials on the work of the International Commission of Inquiry into Israeli Crimes against the Lebanese and Palestinian Peoples, which was headed by the well-known English lawyer and Queen's Counsel, John Platts-Mills. The booklet is entitled *Accused of Crimes*, and was published in Moscow in 1983 in Russian, English and French.

The second book is a report by the International Commission which was headed by the famous Irish politician Seán McBride, who holds the international Lenin prize "For Strengthening Peace Among the Peoples" and the Nobel Peace Prize.

Truth is a direct victim of the Israel invasion of Lebanon—Tel Aviv and its protectors from Washington are trying to falsify it. The publications which we have shown you are intended to restore it. The world must find out the truth. The actions of the Israeli army against the Palestinian and Lebanese civilian population during military operations can only be qualified as genocide. The mass extermination of the Palestinian Arabs in the Sabra and Chatila camps and the torture in the Ansar concentration camp will remain forever in people's memories as one of the most dreadful crimes against humanity.

The international solidarity of honest people, journalists, publicists, and publishers in condemning Zionism manifested itself in the publication of a whole host of interesting books and collections of documents. Here is one of them—*I witness*. It was published in London in 1983 and gives the materials of 91 photographic correspondents. The photograph album *God Cried* by Tony Clifton and Catherine Leroy was also published there. The Japanese journalist R. Khirokava released a photograph album which has become a denunciatory document of colossal force exposing the crimes of Israel. It is entitled *From the Israeli Invasion to Murders in the Palestinian Camps of Sabra and Chatila*, and was published in Tokyo in 1982.

In January 1984, a new book came out in Rome dedicated to the tragedy which occurred in Lebanon. It is called *Sabra and Chatila—Photographic Evidence of Genocide* (R. Napoleone publishers), and is based on rich factual material and carries many photographs.

APN correspondent: Can you describe Israel's system of crimes against Lebanon and the Palestinians in more detail?

M. Krupkin: The war in Lebanon is justly called Israel's most brutal war against the Arabs. Its awful peculiarity is that it is mainly being waged against the civilian population. It is enough to recall that 80 per cent of the victims in Lebanon, who are counted in thousands and thousands of dead and wounded, are

defenceless civilians, including a great many children, women and old men.

As A. A. Gromyko, the USSR Minister for Foreign Affairs, noted in his speech at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, "Militarism is always inhuman. This is now being seen particularly clearly in Lebanon."

Lebanon has been turned into a range for testing new types of American weapons.

The Israeli aggression against Lebanon is a crime against peace and glaring infringement of international law. We are talking of barbaric mass murders of the civilian population—children, women and old men—and concentrated bombings and artillery shelling. The crimes of the Israeli aggressors fall completely into the category of the most heinous crime—genocide.

By killing Lebanese and Palestinian Arabs the US Marines became accomplices to Israel's genocide in Lebanon. As a matter of fact, the Israeli aggression became an American-Israeli assault.

TASS correspondent: Can the policy of genocide, which Israel is following, somehow influence the principal, initial positions for solving the Palestinian problem?

I. Belyaev: There is only one solution to the Palestinian problem—a fair one. This solution must be based on the UN General Assembly resolution of November 29, 1947, which envisaged the creation of the sovereign national Arab state of Palestine side by side with Israel. Incidentally, the Arab state is named first in the text of the resolution. This means that the legal rights of the Arab Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, must be realised alongside the creation of Israel.

The Lebanese tragedy is not only a tragedy of the Lebanese and the Palestinian Arabs, but also of the Israelis. Tel Aviv's adventurism in foreign policy is turning into a moral degradation of Israeli society. Honest Israelites do not want to remain on the sidelines in this difficult hour for their country, and are conducting an active struggle against their government's policy in Lebanon. I would particularly like to point out the moves of Israeli soldiers and officers who refuse to serve in Lebanon and

thus be the executors of the criminal plans of the Tel Aviv rulers.

I would also like to talk about one more fact on which Israeli politicians do not like to concentrate attention. As you remember, in 1956, 1967 and 1982, the government of Israel justified its expansionist course by the supposedly real threat to the very existence of the state of Israel and the necessity to guarantee the safety of Israeli citizens.

What then is going on now? The Shamir government is showing criminal indifference to the death of Israeli soldiers in Lebanon. Young Israelites meet their death sent by criminal rulers so that criminal plans of aggression and expansion might be realised, and, in the final analysis, for the carrying through of Washington's imperial interests.

Peace and Progress Radio correspondent: Is there any evidence of former Soviet citizens dying in Lebanon?

S. Zivs: The fact that the Israeli government stubbornly hides its true losses in Lebanon has its own explanation. The Zionists urgently "invite" Jews from all over the world to resettle in Israel, but who will go there if he knows that Israeli politicians have already prepared a piece of the "Promised Land" as a grave for this or that Jew?

The Zionists have been conducting a single-minded campaign for many years, trying to persuade Jews in the USSR and other socialist countries to emigrate to Israel, where they promise them a truly "heavenly" existence in the "land of milk and honey".

In practice all these promises turn into fairly real prospect of death. Announcements appear in the Israeli press of the death of former Soviet citizens who gave in to the persuasion of Zionist propaganda and met their death in Lebanon.

These announcements are more evidence of the tragic fate of people who, having given in to Zionist propaganda found themselves lured into the trap (in the most direct sense). They became willing or unwilling accomplices to the Israeli aggression and met their death in Lebanon.

KUNA Information Agency correspondent (Kuwait): Do you have Jewish national literature in the USSR?

Yu. Kolesnikov: Yes, we do. There are among Soviet Jewish men of letters authors who write in Yiddish. For example, Ilya Gordon, who published the book *Under the Burning Sun* in Yiddish. Like the works of all national literatures, books by Jewish writers are translated into Russian and other languages of the USSR. In this way they exist in a single stream of multinational Soviet literature.

The magazine *Sovetish Heimland* is published in Yiddish in our country, and newspapers, magazines and books come out in Yiddish in the Jewish Autonomous Region, which will widely celebrate its 50th anniversary in 1984. The same should be said about the theatres which put on productions of the classics and of works by modern Soviet dramatists in Yiddish.

"Washington Post" correspondent: Why was the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee only founded a year ago?

S. Zivs: It is well known that Soviet public opinion has always had a negative attitude to Zionism, its ideology and political practice. International Zionism has recently ever more actively been taking part in the anti-Soviet and anti-communist subversive activity of imperialism. Various Zionist organisations have increased their interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, trying to undermine the national unity of the Soviet people. Further, the ideology and political practice of the ruling circles of Israel and international Zionism have recently become particularly dangerous and are actively being used to worsen the international situation the world over. The escalation of the danger which Zionism bears to peace is one of the reasons which led to the creation of our Committee.

D. Dragunskii: I would like to add that the policy of the ruling circles of Israel in the Middle East is taking on an ever more fascist nature. We have always been against Israel's wars of aggression in the Middle East, but the escalation of the Israeli expansionist policy and its increasing fascist nature have resulted in Soviet public opinion deeming it necessary to step up its anti-Zionist struggle.

S. Rokotov

ZIONISM IN THE FIGHT AGAINST SOCIALISM AND DETENTE

A LITTLE BIT OF HISTORY

From the moment Zionism came into the political arena the leaders of its organisations offered their services to the ruling circles of the imperialist powers in the fight against the revolutionary movement. First Theodor Herzl, then Chaim Weizmann, who replaced him as president of the World Zionist Organization, Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the US Supreme Court, and other Zionist figures proved to their imperialist patrons that Zionism was the most effective weapon for the fight with progressive tendencies amongst the Jewish population. During the First World War the Zionists offered their services both to the leaders of the Entente and to the German government in exchange for support for Zionist plans in Palestine. The work of the World Zionist Organisation received official blessing from the ruling circles of Great Britain, of which the Balfour Declaration is evidence. This declaration of the British Foreign Secretary contained a promise to further "...the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people".¹⁻² It was not by accident that the Balfour Declaration was released on November 2nd, 1917. With its help the British imperialists were banking not only on guaranteeing a pretext for the occupation of Palestine, but also on bringing pressure to bear on the situation in revolutionary Russia.

Anti-Semitism, which had become widespread in the ruling circles of Britain and other imperialist countries, facilitated the spreading of mythical ideas that the revolution in Russia was the result of a "Jewish conspiracy". Moreover, on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution, some Western political leaders were cultivating the nonsensical illusions that a deal with the Zionists would enable them to avert the downfall of the Provisional Government. The British Foreign Office and its represen-

tatives in Petrograd groundlessly demonstrated the need for rapid action to attract the Jewish population of Russia to the side of the Entente and counterrevolution. As the British historian Christopher Sykes notes, before the Balfour Declaration "... it was believed that open British support of Zionism would detach Russian Jews from the Bolshevik party and so ensure that the Revolution would remain not only moderate but the belligerent ally of France and Britain".³

As early as November 3rd, 1917, a Foreign Office representative had discussed measures for the fight with Bolshevism with Zionist leaders. In order to divert the Jewish masses from participating in the revolutionary movement, it was decided to send Nahum Sokolow, Vladimir Jabotinsky and Yehiel Tchlenow, the leaders of the World Zionist Organisation, and Chaim Weizmann, the main lobbyist of the Balfour Declaration, to Russia. Showing complete ignorance of the causes of the revolution, Lord Hardinge, the Permanent Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, declared that by "... skilful management of the Jews in Russia the situation may still be restored by the spring".⁴

Winston Churchill, the inspirer of the "fourteen powers" campaign" against Soviet Russia openly declared Zionism a way of combatting the "international Bolshevik-Jewish conspiracy". Proceeding from anti-communist and anti-Semitic premises, he said of Zionism: "... [the] schemes of a worldwide communistic State under Jewish domination are directly thwarted and hindered by this new ideal, which directs the energies and the hopes of Jews in every land towards a simpler, a truer, and a far more attainable goal. The struggle which is now beginning between the Zionist and Bolshevik Jews is little less than a struggle for the soul of the Jewish people. . .".⁵

The following document can serve as a graphic illustration of how imperialist circles strengthened Zionism:

"Strictly Confidential: Memorandum of Interview in Mr. Balfour's apartment, 23 Rue Nitot, on Tuesday, June 24, 1919, at 4:45 p.m.

"Present: Mr. Balfour, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Lord Eustace Percy and Mr. Frankfurter. . . .

"He [Brandeis] narrated his own approach to Zionism, that he came to it wholly as an American, for his whole life had been

free from Jewish contacts or traditions. As an American he was confronted with the disposition of the vast numbers of Jews, particularly Russian Jews, that were pouring into the United States year by year. It was then that by chance a pamphlet of Zionism came his way and led him to the study of the Jewish problem and to the conviction that Zionism was the answer. The very same men, with the same qualities that are now enlisted in revolutionary movement would find, and in the United States do find, constructive channels for expression and make positive contributions to civilisation.

“Mr. Balfour interrupted to express his agreement, adding—‘Of course these are the reasons that make you and me such ardent Zionists’.”⁶

We can judge what was meant by “constructive channels”, for example, from the memoirs of Jacob de Haas. A Zionist, de Haas began his career as the secretary of Theodor Herzl, and was then the closest assistant of Louis D. Brandeis, the leader of the American Zionists, for many years. He wrote: “The great strength of the American Zionist organisation was in the multifariousness of its contacts, and in the accurate knowledge of those in control of the human resources on which they could depend. Did the British need to obtain a contact in Odessa, or were they in need of a trustworthy agent in Harbin?

“Did President Wilson require at short notice a thousand-word summary detailing those who were in the Kerensky upheaval in Russia? The New York office rendered all these services. . .”⁷

During the period of the socialist revolution, eighteen various Zionist parties and organisations were operating in Russia, which as a rule had contacts with foreign centres in capitalist countries. Having taken the position of supporting the bourgeois Provisional Government, they actively fought against the establishment of Soviet power, and during the Civil War they closed ranks with the forces of counterrevolution.

Having failed to secure a mass social base and the political support of working Jews, Zionist organisations in Soviet Russia collapsed, and in these conditions the centres of Zionism banked on subversive activities against Soviet power.

As early as the 1920s, the bourgeois nationalist leaders of Jewish communities in the USA and other capitalist countries

where Zionist activity received official blessing had started an anti-Soviet campaign under the spurious slogan of "The Defence of Jews Against Bolshevik Anti-Semitism". The Zionist slander forms the main content of their anti-Soviet fabrications even today.

The Zionists have not concealed their fierce hatred for the communist movement. Berl Katzenelson, one of the Zionist leaders in Palestine, said: "We are still faced with the task of training our youth to rebel against . . . those Jews who were so much the slaves of the Russian Revolution, . . . including the Palestinian Communist Party of our day. . . ."⁸

In the 1940s, international Zionism reorientated itself to American imperialism as the leading power in the capitalist system and the main pretender to "world domination". At secret discussions in Washington, Zionist circles promised not to begrudge efforts for the fight against the forces of socialism and progress in return for support for their plans on the part of the United States.

On February 25th, 1948, there was a meeting in the US State Department between Norman Armour (Assistant to the Secretary of State) and Charles Bohlen, a State Department adviser, on the one hand, and Benzion Netanyahu and Joseph B. Schechtman, both prominent figures in the Revisionist Party, on the other. The Zionists assured the American diplomats that the newly-created Jewish state would be a "champion of Western ideals" and a "bastion against Communist penetration in the Middle East". They recorded their ideas in a letter delivered to Charles Bohlen on March 2nd, 1948, which, in particular, read: "We urge the active support of the United States for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine because we contend that this lies in the well-understood interest of the United States: a Jewish State, if established with the cooperation of the U.S., will necessarily become a bastion of the Western world in the Middle East, a national ally of the United States, bound to it by ties of gratitude and common interest."⁹ The letter went on to assert that such an American policy would prove to ". . . Jews all over the world . . . that America is a friendly power and a reliable ally.

"This and only this, will stop the dangerous pro-Soviet trend . . . and will secure the enthusiastic allegiance of world Jewry

and of the Jewish State to the cause of the Western Allies.”¹⁰

The Zionists were active in the stirring up of the cold war, specialists from amongst their number of anti-communist propaganda being drawn into the provocative activity of The Voice of America, the BBC, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. The forged documents about “anti-Semitism” in the USSR and other socialist countries were printed on the pages of the bourgeois press.

Zionist circles, which had taken a course of co-operation with the imperialist powers, seized power from the very outset in Israel. In 1950 the Israeli government openly supported the American aggression in Korea.¹¹ At a meeting of the Cabinet, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion even suggested sending Israeli soldiers to Korea to take part in the war of aggression.¹²

As the facts show, the ruling circles of Israel linked the fate of this state with American imperialism.

ALONG THE PATH OF ESPIONAGE AND PROVOCATION

Israeli intelligence rendered its services to the special services of the USA and other imperialist powers in the conducting of subversive activities against the Soviet Union. In the 1950s it concluded a special agreement with the CIA, which was extremely interested in using Zionist cadres. As the British author Anthony Pearson writes, “... the CIA, which was very weak in an area formerly dominated only by British Intelligence, became interested in the operations of Mossad, the Israeli Intelligence Service (IIS), and agreed on a deal with the Israelis by which they would work as a combined unit, relying entirely upon IIS penetration of surrounding Arab countries for all intelligence relating to the area, including the Soviet presence in it”.¹³ James Angleton, the head of the CIA special operations department, had played a special role in the arrangement of this co-operation. In the words of Anthony Pearson, “...his own plans were rooted in virulent anti-Soviet feelings, not in any sentimental support for the Jewish State”.¹⁴

The American author Alfred M. Lilienthal bears witness to how close the co-operation between the secret services of the

USA and Israel was: "Chief of the CIA Richard Helms continued to allow all U.S. intelligence operations inside Israel to be conducted through Mossad. There was no CIA station chief in Tel Aviv; officers working under cover in the American Embassy acted in consort with Israeli intelligence officers, each supposedly having full access to the other's information."¹⁵

The Zionists tried to use Israeli diplomatic representations for their subversive activities against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Acting under the guise of diplomats, employees of the Israeli secret service time and again were caught while gathering secret information, as well as organising forged documents designed to prove non-existent "Soviet anti-Semitism".

However, the Zionists' provocations suffered failure. The case of a certain Dolnik, who was arrested on May 26th, 1966 under Article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, became a particular example of this. By means of an investigation drive it was proved that in 1965 Dolnik made contact with employees of the Israeli Embassy in Moscow and passed them a number of materials which had earlier been ordered by Israel. In gathering the slanderous information demanded of him by the embassy representatives, Dolnik resorted to direct forgery. For example, he fabricated "photographic documents" which were to serve as proof of "Soviet anti-Semitism". At the Jewish cemetery he photographed a few tombstones and then, with the help of a montage, prepared forged photographs, on which the tombstones were defaced with swastikas. For passing various kinds of "information" to the Israelis, he was materially rewarded.¹⁶

After diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel were broken off in 1967, Zionist circles began to make greater use of tourism, scientific and technical, cultural, and trade exchanges to send their emissaries to the Soviet Union. The employees of some Western embassies and a number of bourgeois newspaper correspondents in Moscow also maintained close contact with the Zionists. Here, efforts were made to involve Soviet citizens in anti-state activity and to use them to gather secret information and forge anti-Soviet documents. At the beginning of the 1970s, Candidate of Medical Sciences S. L. Lipavskii, a Muscovite, found himself amongst their number. Having subsequently realised the criminal nature of the activity of the "Jewish activists"

group, of which he was a member, Lipavskii published an open letter in the Soviet press.

“Although these people had various opinions as to forms and methods of action,” he wrote of the group’s members, “they had a unified platform and a single leader—American intelligence and foreign anti-Soviet organisations. They systematically obtained instructions, hostile literature and financial resources through underground channels. Their work was guided by D. Azbel, A. Lerner and V. Rubin... As early as 1972 it became known to me that this ruling group was closely linked with the employees of some foreign embassies and accredited correspondents in Moscow. The most steady contacts were with Melvin Levitsky and Joseph Pressel, both of whom worked at the US Embassy, and with the American correspondents Peter Osnos, Fred Friendly and some others. In the flats of Rubin and Lerner, the aforementioned foreigners as well as the visiting emissaries from anti-Soviet centres Schmuckler, Noom, Manekofski and others discussed and made various recommendations which essentially boiled down to a perversion of the problems of civil liberties and of human rights in the USSR.”¹⁷

It should be pointed out that this small group of renegades, who had called themselves “Jewish activists”, operated directly under the guidance of the CIA. Lipavskii wrote: “One of the documents I was passed in September 1975 via an especially secret hiding place said on behalf of the CIA: ‘Our government is naturally interested in information concerning the Jewish movement... We respect your concern and participation in this movement, but by concentrating on fulfilling our requests, you can, in time, be more effective in your fight with the system.’”¹⁸

Anti-Soviet provocations were painstakingly prepared. L. B. Tsipin, another member of the underground group, made this confession: “Our ‘acts’ were timed for state holidays, top level meetings, international conferences, etc., as a rule. Foreign emissaries travelling as tourists or certain foreign newsmen and diplomats in Moscow instructed us when and whom we were to ‘defend’. We then determined the time, the place, made the appropriate posters, and of course informed foreign reporters ahead of time. We also told them the names of those who would take part in the coming ‘acts’ so that the information would be passed on to our bosses as quickly as possible.”¹⁹

The co-ordinated efforts of the centres of Zionism, Israeli intelligence and the special services of the USA and other imperialist countries will not bring success to their organisers. Nonetheless, the Israeli government and the leaders of international Zionist organisations are unwilling to accept the fact that they have lost the possibility forever of establishing control over the Jewish population in our country and in other socialist countries.

AGENTS PROVOCATEURS DISGUISED AS "DEFENDERS OF SOVIET JEWS"

The Zionists originally advanced the motto of "Free Development of Jewish Culture and Religious Activity in the USSR", openly laying claim to the "right" to conduct nationalistic propaganda amongst Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality. This attempt at interference in the internal affairs of the USSR naturally failed. Then the claim of the "right of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel" was placed at the forefront at the end of the 1960s. Under the cover of this slogan, Zionist circles and their imperialist patrons were banking not only on breaking the unity of the multinational Soviet people, but also on supplying Israel with new cannon fodder with which to conduct aggression against neighbouring countries, and new settlers to colonise the occupied Arab lands. The peculiar fervour of the American Zionists in conducting this campaign is explained to a certain extent by their efforts somehow to compensate for their own disinclination to fulfill the World Zionist Organisation's programme and move to the "Promised Land"**.

The Zionists' anti-Soviet campaign acquired a particularly wide scope since the beginning of the Israeli aggression in 1967. Laying bare the causes of this campaign, Gus Hall, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party USA wrote that anti-Sovietism is linked with the role of the Soviet Union in the Middle East... "The assistance of the Soviet Union has made it possible for the Arab nations to fight

* "About 2,000 Jews are reportedly leaving the country [the US] each month, and more than 800,000 Israelis (out of a population of 3.9 million) are living overseas."—*The New York Times*, August 3, 1982.

for their liberation. They are able to fight the Israel-U. S. sponsored aggression.

“The extreme and hysterical campaign to spread anti-Sovietism in the Jewish communities is directly related to this struggle.”²⁰

As for the malicious and provocative anti-Soviet propaganda, which has been deployed by the Israeli government and international Zionism on a worldwide scale, the XIX Congress of the Israeli Communist Party showed that “...the anti-Sovietism of Israel’s ruling circles and the Zionist leaders is becoming ever more intense, reflecting their reaction to the fact that the Soviet Union is following a peaceful policy, asserting the rights of the peoples, opposing the Israeli occupation of Arab territories and supporting the creation of an independent Palestinian Arab state alongside the state of Israel”.²¹

In 1971 and 1976 anti-Soviet gatherings were conducted in Brussels under the libellous slogan of the fight against “Soviet anti-Semitism”. Thus, it was far from an accident that the former Israeli prime ministers David Ben-Gurion (in 1971) and Golda Meir (1976) figured at these assemblies as “stars”. There were also leaders of American Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations among the organisers and participants of these provocations: William Wexler, the chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations; Arthur Goldberg, Honorary President of the American Jewish Committee and a former member of the US Supreme Court; Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld, president of the American Jewish Congress; Emanuel Litvinoff, the publisher of a British Zionist magazine; Jerry Goodman, the director of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry; and Faye Schenk, the president of “Hadassah”, the Women’s Zionist Organisation of America, et al.

A broad programme of anti-Soviet activity was worked out at the conference in 1971. Thus, the Commission on Work with Government layed special stress on expanding contacts with politicians in the free world in order through them to increase pressure on the USSR. The necessity was also emphasised of influencing the governments of Latin America, Asia and Africa. The Commission on Work with Jurists adopted recommendations on methods of concealing anti-Soviet provocations by references to international law. The Commission on Work with

Youth, which was headed by Mordechai Bar-On, who also headed the Youth and Hechalutz Department of the WZO, came out with proposals on how to direct young people's political activity toward anti-Sovietism. The Commission on Mass Media generalised the "experience" of disseminating forged documents about "Soviet anti-Semitism" in newspapers and magazines, and on the radio and television. The Commission on Work with Non-Governmental Organisations prepared recommendations on drawing church establishments, political parties, professional associations, trade unions, organisations representing national minorities etc. into the Zionist campaign.

Today the ramified network of anti-Soviet organisations does not only exist in American Jewish communities. In Britain, the Women's Campaign for Soviet Jewry, the National Council of Youth in Defence of Soviet Jews, and the National Council for Soviet Jewry were all established with this aim. Apart from that, the Soviet Jewry Committee of the Board of Deputies of British Jews was set up, which works in close contact with the All-Party Parliamentary Committee for Soviet Jewry. This entire organisational complex is continually fanning an anti-Soviet sensation, trying at the same time to exert influence on the stand of governmental institutions in Britain.

At the same time, Zionist organisations have expanded their activity, resorting to open violence to hamper detente between the USSR and the capitalist countries. Attacks on Soviet diplomatic, trade and economic representations, attempts to ruin appearances by Soviet artists and athletes, and arson and the use of firearms—such are the methods used by the Jewish Defense League and similar organisations like the Jewish Armed Resistance gang.

A number of Jewish organisations which were previously of progressive orientation have also gone over to anti-Soviet positions under the influence of Zionist propaganda. In the USA, for example, after 1967 the directors of the *Morning Freiheit* newspaper and the *Jewish Currents* magazine, as well as people grouping around them, all became included in the anti-Soviet campaign. Having slid into pro-Zionist positions, they recognised the Israeli aggression as being a "defensive" act and accused the Soviet Union of intending to "destroy Israel". Distorting the facts, they tried to show that the Soviet Union had

rejected its Leninist policy on the Jewish question and was practising “official anti-Semitism”. To justify its position, this group of anti-Sovietists put forward the spurious thesis that there exist two Zionisms—“reactionary” and “progressive”.

It is also important to note that the National Conference on Soviet Jewry was reorganised in 1971, into which came practically all the main organisations—both Zionist and “non-Zionist”—of the American Jewish community. Local divisions of the NCSJ were also created, which were responsible for conducting campaigns “in defence of Soviet Jews” within Jewish communities and acted as patrons over the relevant Soviet towns, establishing contact with so-called “Jewish activists” and potential emigrants. For example, local divisions of the NCSJ in New York receive instructions on writing letters, sending telegrams, making phone calls and organising personal meetings with Soviet citizens in Moscow, as well as obtaining the addresses of synagogues, scientific workers who have put in an application to leave the USSR, and “Jewish activists” who have been legally convicted of anti-Soviet activity. The NCSJ arranges demonstrations “in support of Soviet Jews”, and also boycotts of Soviet artists, exhibitions etc. abroad.

Campaigns “in defence of Soviet Jews” were one of the ways of kindling nationalistic sentiments amongst the part of Jewish youth in Western countries which had been taken in by Zionist propaganda. Developing the spurious thesis of “anti-Semitism” and trying to gamble on the anti-fascist feelings of the Jewish population, the Zionists advanced, for example, libellous assertions that in the USSR cultural genocide was being carried out in respect of Jews and that this should be regarded as only slightly less evil than the Nazis’ “final solution” to the Jewish problem.

There are several more organisations apart from the NCSJ, which specialise in work “in defence of the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate”: The Committee for the Repatriation of Soviet Jews, The Committee for the Liberation of Enslaved Soviet Jews, “Al Tidom”, the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, and the Jewish Defense League, each of which has its own definite direction of anti-Soviet activity.

For example, the Committee for the Repatriation of Soviet Jews and “Al Tidom” send emissaries to the Soviet Union whose

functions include setting up groups of so-called "Jewish activists", recruiting potential emigrants, and dispersing Zionist and religious literature, ritual objects etc. Wide use is made of international tourism for such operations.

We ought particularly to pause on the activity of the Jewish Defense League, which combines frenzied anti-Sovietism with an extremely reactionary stance on all questions of American public life.

The political programme and tactics of the JDL bear an unconcealed pro-fascist character. It is in this that it mainly differs from the majority of "respectable" Jewish organisations, which are trying to give a liberal slant to their nationalistic, anti-Soviet activity and to direct their attention to liberal circles in the American political arena. The JDL should be viewed as a kind of catalyst of the anti-Soviet campaign in the Jewish community. Under pressure from and screened by the JDL, the main Jewish bourgeois-nationalistic organisations of the USA significantly broadened the scales of their anti-Soviet activity and supplemented their tactics of "undercover diplomacy" with open political pressure. This included the organisation of demonstrations, boycotts and so on. For the Zionists the activity of the Jewish Defense League is, above all, a "testing ground" for testing the influence of anti-Soviet slogans on the Jewish population. It is also an instrument for creating provocative sensations around the contrived question of "official Soviet anti-Semitism". Moreover, the JDL has demonstrated the possibility of directing the dissatisfaction of significant strata of Jewish youth into a nationalistic channel, which weakens the influence on them of progressive organisations. Finally, the JDL has begun to put fairly strong pressure on those bourgeois circles of the American Jewish community which, in their time, expressed doubt about the expediency of organising a broad anti-Soviet campaign.

Although the support of the American Jewish community for the JDL's adventurous activity has recently fallen significantly, the League still remains a strike detachment of the anti-Soviet crusade of international Zionism.

Proceeding from anti-Soviet political aims, Zionist propaganda asserts that the "majority of Soviet Jews is seeking to leave the USSR". In this it appeals to the most diverse reasons for emigrating—moral and ideological, political, spiritual, cultural,

and consumer reasons. Emigration is advertised as a way of resolving "spiritual and cultural" and other ideals, and is also "based" on religious motives.

The main aim of this campaign is to try to break the unity of the Soviet peoples, awaken nationalistic feelings amongst Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality and provoke enmity toward Jews in other Soviet citizens. As has already been said, the Zionists are at the same time trying to pick up masses of immigrants to "settle" in the occupied Arab lands. All this provocative activity is being directed by the Israeli government.

Zionist propaganda tries day after day to incline people of Jewish nationality to emigrate to Israel. The spearhead of this ideological brainwashing is directed at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and uses radio, television, the printed word and emissaries from centres of Zionism who try to enter our country under the guise of tourists. Parcels and letters are sent from imaginary relatives. In most cases Zionist propaganda does not succeed in inclining this or that person to emigrate, and when this happens they try to blackmail or intimidate him.

The vast majority of Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality categorically reject the calls of the Zionist bosses to leave the Soviet Motherland for the "Promised Land", and do not recognise the "dual nationality" foisted on them by the ruling circles of Israel. They do not need the "defence" or the "protection" of foreign centres of Zionism or Zionist organisations. Born and brought up in the Soviet Union, a country of full equality of citizens of any nationality, the absolute majority of Soviet Jews live and work for the building of communism, filled with a feeling of deep Soviet patriotism and internationalism.

What, then, are the main aims of Zionist propaganda? Firstly, to discredit the Soviet order and the economic system of socialism, as well as the Leninist policy of the CPSU, the Soviet way of life, and socialist democracy; secondly, to kindle a "chain-reaction of nationalism" in the USSR, spread a myth about "internal opposition" and erode socialism from within; and, thirdly, to pervert the foreign policy course of the USSR, which is aimed at a reduction in international tension.

The achievement of these strategic aims is divided by imperialist and Zionist propaganda to a number of tactical operations which try to neutralise the Marxist-Leninist conviction of Soviet

citizens and replace it with a bourgeois and nationalistic ideology. They also seek to provoke anti-Soviet sentiments and create new "moral understandings" and stances amongst certain groups of the Soviet population.

Zionist and pro-Zionist propaganda is urgently puffing up the thesis that the fight against Zionism is ostensibly tantamount to anti-Semitism. In 1974 Arnold Foster and Benjamin R. Epstein, the leaders of the pro-Zionist Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, published *The New Anti-Semitism*, a libellous book in which they declare as the "enemies of Jews" all those who do not share Zionist dogmas, above all, citizens of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, communist parties, other progressive organisations and even bourgeois figures who criticise the aggressive policy of Israel's ruling circles.²²⁻²⁴ At the same time, Zionist propaganda tries to pass off as the "friends of Jews" all reactionary forces which support the Israeli extremists, and to conceal the co-operation of Jewish bourgeois nationalists with all kinds of anti-communist and anti-Soviet groupings, many of which hold anti-Semitic positions.

Slanderously accusing the Soviet Union of wanting to "destroy" Israel and spreading forged documents about "Soviet state-sponsored anti-Semitism", Zionist circles have sunk to such a monstrous lie as declaring the USSR the "main enemy of Jews all over the world". The demand advanced by the Zionists for the "freedom of Soviet Jews to emigrate" proved to be a convenient pretext for the imperialists' fight against a lessening of international tension.

THE FIGHT AGAINST DETENTE: THE JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT

In the 1970s the Zionist campaign "in defence of Soviet Jews" became one of the main weapons of the opponents of a normalisation of American-Soviet relations, and of the enemies of the new tendencies in international relations. By this time a ramified anti-Soviet propaganda network had been set up by the WZO and other Jewish bourgeois-nationalistic organisations to serve the military-industrial complex of the USA.

This network facilitated the advancement of the provocative

question of the “position of Soviet Jews” to one of the first places on the agenda of the US Congress in the first half of the 1970s. There were also other reasons caused, for example, by an increase in the influence of the Zionist lobby and the pro-Israeli coalition in the Senate and the House of Representatives, which, by then, had significantly broadened their political base.

The aim of the Zionist lobby was to achieve an American stance which would make the improvement of Soviet-American relations dependent on the “permission of free Jewish emigration from the USSR”. In order to carry out this task, Zionist circles chose the tactic of “tying” the question of emigration to the repeal of trade discrimination in respect of the Soviet Union, which was set out in the Jackson-Vanik Amendment.

The mixed composition of supporters of Congress’s “tough” position on the “question of Soviet Jews” took shape as a result of the fairly complex aims pursued by Senators and Congressmen, which exaggerated the problem. The approach of Jacob Javits and a number of other liberal Senators to the question of the “position of Soviet Jews” was determined by a wish to ensure a development of the process of detente between the USA and the USSR along the way which would correspond, to a maximum extent, to American interests. The concept of detente, which had circulated in liberal circles in Congress, was drawn up on the erroneous premise that the Soviet Union could be compelled to re-examine its principled line not only in international affairs, but also in its domestic policy for the sake of improving relations with the United States. Many liberal bourgeois figures, therefore, including Jacob Javits and Abraham Ribicoff, reckoned on using the “question of Soviet Jews” to set a precedent in Soviet-American relations and officially fortify the “right” of the USA to interfere in the USSR’s domestic policy.

In contrast to the liberal members of Congress, who, in their own way, had believed in the possibility of “tying” detente to interference in the internal affairs of the USSR, figures such as Senator Jackson, who came out against detente in principle, were guided by other ideas. The binding of the question of Soviet Jews to the normalisation of trade relations allowed right-wing members of Congress to resist one of the main directions

of Soviet-American detente at the same time as not directly opposing the then President Richard Nixon, who favoured a normalisation of Soviet-American relations. The pseudo-humanitarian nature of the emigration question gave the opponents of detente the opportunity to hide the true character of their stance and provided a convenient cover for them to regroup their forces, with the aim of freezing the process of detente, stopping it, and then discarding it altogether.

In Congress it was Senator Jackson who led the campaign to "tie" the emigration question to that of American-Soviet trade relations. In principle he was able to carry behind him a maximally broad coalition—from liberal Democrats to conservative Republicans. Firstly, being among the more active supporters of the foreign policy course of the military-industrial complex, Jackson as a rule sided with conservative Republican Senators. Secondly, he was well-known for his moderate liberal position on questions of internal policy and enjoyed the constant support of the leadership of the AFL-CIO, and, thirdly, he appeared for many years as one of the leaders of the pro-Israeli coalition in Congress and established the closest of links with the Zionist lobby and the Israeli leadership.

However, far from all shared Jackson's approach in the American Jewish community, including in bourgeois-nationalistic circles. To many representatives of the Jewish bourgeois-nationalistic establishment, undercover pressure on the administration seemed more effective, with the aim of using the latter's influence to guarantee the influx of emigrants Israel had demanded. Such an approach could be called "parasitism" on detente. Senators such as Jacob Javits and Abraham Ribicoff, who were famous for their pro-Israeli opinions, also held such positions. But Senator Jackson took the initiative into his own hands, which permitted a strengthening of a much more extreme approach to this question in Zionist and pro-Zionist circles. This, in its turn, gave Jackson the corresponding tribune or political base to develop his campaign for an amendment to the trade law. This amendment envisaged "free emigration" of citizens of Jewish nationality from the Soviet Union as a condition for granting the USSR most-favored-nation status. As a result this question moved to the forefront in the struggle of American reactionary forces against detente.

As early as September 1972, the Jackson machine had begun working out the legislative framework which would make the granting of most-favored-nation status to the USSR conditional on a change in the USSR's policy on the emigration question. The text of the amendment to the trade bill, which included the administration's suggestion to grant the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status, was composed directly by activists of the Zionist lobby in Washington: Richard Perle, assistant to Senator Jackson, and Morris Amitay, assistant to Senator Ribicoff.

Before presenting the amendment to the Senate, Jackson had to enlist the support of the bourgeois-nationalistic leadership of the American Jewish community. At a Washington meeting of 120 Jewish leaders called by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry on September 26th, 1972, he waxed emotional: "Get behind my amendment. And let's stand firm!"²⁵

However, Jackson was not able to gain approval for this line immediately, because a group of Jewish community leaders was closely linked with the National Conference on Soviet Jewry Committee to Re-Elect the President (CREP), and was actively agitating for the Republican President amongst Jewish voters. They therefore did not want to find themselves in opposition to the Nixon administration on the eve of the elections. Apart from that, supporters of Nahum Goldmann, the then president of the World Jewish Congress, were amongst the participants in the NCSJ meeting. It was they who moved the slogan of "free cultural and national development of Soviet Jews" to the forefront, yet failed to show particular enthusiasm for the demands for "free emigration".²⁶ Finally, representatives of Senator Javits attended the conference and came out in favour of a "less tough" approach to the emigration question. To a certain extent their stance was explained by rival ideas—they were dissatisfied with Jackson's aspiration to present himself as the main "defender of Jewish affairs" and so to "monopolise" the political and economic support of the Jewish community in his own hands. There was also one more important element in the stance of liberal Senators. They, and particularly Jacob Javits, had for many years supported the policy of "bridging the gap" with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They saw the expansion of trade between East and West as an important instrument of this policy. The competition between Jackson and Javits creat-

ed definite difficulties for the supporters of the amendment.

In these conditions, the persuasion of Senators was intensified during the campaign started by the NCSJ on the grass-roots level, and in the run-up to the elections the demagogic campaign "in defence of Soviet Jews" gathered speed. Jackson and the Zionist lobbyists succeeded in exerting pressure on their opponent by organising protest in the Jewish community accusing Javits of being "soft" in respect of the Soviet Union. The "revolt" within the pro-Israel coalition was liquidated.

Henry Jackson officially presented his amendment to the trade bill to the Senate on October 5th, 1972. By now the list of co-initiators of this amendment numbered 76 Senators, which automatically guaranteed its adoption by the Senate. An active campaign then began in the House of Representatives, where Congressman Charles Vanik presented a similar amendment.

The Zionist lobby in Washington and beyond deployed a mass campaign of pressure on members of the House of Representatives, acting both directly and through the voters: "Vanik's administrative assistant, Mark Talisman, began a morning-to-night round of telephone calls to all 435 Congressional offices, inviting each member to be listed as co-sponsoring the same language (the Vanik amendment—*S.R.*) in the new session. He called some offices as many as 15 times. A simultaneous grass-roots campaign organised by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry began producing a steady harvest of constituent mail, even to Congressmen who had few Jewish constituents. The mail increased following a Jan. 18 letter to about 1.000 Jewish leaders across the country from a close associate of the Washington group, I. L. Kennen, executive vice-chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, which is registered to lobby for Israel"²⁷, *The New York Times* magazine wrote. Charles Vanik introduced his amendment, which had been signed by 259 co-authors, to the House of Representatives on February 7th, 1973.

In his memoirs, former President Nixon characterised the groupings which united on the Jackson-Vanik Amendment platform: "... a fusion of forces from opposite ends of the political spectrum had resulted in a curious coalition. Kissinger later described it as a rare convergence, like an eclipse of the sun. On the one side the liberals and the American Zionists had decided that now was the time to challenge the Soviet Union's ... emi-

gration policies, particularly with respect to Soviet Jews. On the other side were the conservatives, who had traditionally opposed detente because it challenged their ideological opposition to contacts with Communist countries. My request in April 1973 for congressional authority to grant most-favored-nation trade status to the Soviet Union became the rallying point for both groups: the liberals wanted MFN legislation to be conditioned on eased emigration policies, the conservatives wanted MFN defeated on the principle that detente was bad by definition.”²⁸

The Jackson-Vanik Amendment seriously influenced the position of Congress in respect of the Soviet Union. Attempts by some members of the administration to hinder the introduction of the amendment by having private discussions with distinguished Congress members did not and could not have any result. Moreover, high-ranking administration officials tried to use this amendment to exert pressure on the Soviet Union and gain “concessions” on this question. Richard Nixon and his entourage essentially did not place the motives of the authors of the amendment under question. In a letter to Congress on April 10th, 1973, concerning the introduction of the trade reform bill, the President expressed an understanding of “the deep concern which many of the Congress have expressed” over the emigration question. But at the same time he wrote that he did not share the opinion that “... a policy of denying most-favored-nation treatment to Soviet export is a proper or even effective way of dealing with this problem”.²⁹ He argued that “free emigration” could be achieved using “quiet diplomacy”.

It should be stressed that the White House’s position was by no means consistent, and, in fact, played into Jackson’s hands. The Nixon administration had co-operated closely with Jackson on many important foreign policy questions, such as the war in Indochina, the situation in the Middle East, or the building up of America’s military potential. Henry Kissinger writes in his memoirs: “To my astonishment I found myself in confrontation with a former ally in what became an increasingly tense relationship. What made the conflict both strange and painful was that I felt more comfortable with Jackson on most issues than with many newfound allies who questioned his amendment from a different philosophical perspective.”³⁰

As a result, the administration failed to take measures in time

to break up the coalition of supporters of the Jackson Amendment, which the White House was banking on using to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. Kissinger acknowledges that "Senator Jackson and the Nixon administration were both committed to the same objective: increasing emigration from the Soviet Union. The dispute was over tactics. The administration doubted that overt pressure could succeed; Jackson insisted that no other method would work".³¹ Kissinger was forced to admit that, instead of fighting the opponents of detente, the administration was hoping to come to a kind of "compromise" with Jackson and the Zionist circles.

In the spring of 1973 the administration began behind the curtain talks with both prominent Congressmen and Zionist lobbyists. For example, on April 19th, 1973, Nixon invited fifteen Jewish leaders to the White House. It was the first time that such a meeting had taken place at the initiative of an American President. Jacob Stein, chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, Charlotte Jacobson, vice-chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and Max Fisher, a man of the president's retinue and former president of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, issued a statement on behalf of all the meeting's participants:

"We expressed our sincere appreciation to the President for the meeting which we regarded as a historic event. The President reaffirmed his concern for the plight of Soviet Jews and pledged his continuing personal efforts on their behalf."³² At the same time, the fact that this demagogic declaration failed to mention the Jackson Amendment showed that the leaders of the Jewish community were not ready unreservedly to give this act their support.

The final decision to support the Jackson Amendment was taken after a number of meetings between the leaders of major Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations. Here, a growing conviction in the weakness of the administration in connection with the unfolding Watergate scandal played its part, too. Tel Aviv's point of view was also reflected in the position adopted by the leadership of the American Jewish community both on this and many other questions. Gerald S. Strober, the executive chairman of the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry, wrote:

"The American Jewish groups rely on the Israelis for intelligence concerning the day-to-day experience of Soviet Jewry and for more analytical projections of trends regarding emigration and Soviet policy directions. Israeli officials often meet with representatives of the major American Jewish agencies to discuss the Russian situation. In general, the Israelis have urged American Jews to continue and even accelerate efforts aimed at keeping pressure on the Soviet government".³³

A new stage in the fight around the Jackson Amendment unfolded in September 1973 when the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives began to discuss it. By this time many members of Congress who had earlier agreed to co-initiate the Amendment were seeking ways of preventing it going to the vote. In the words of the American journalist Joseph Albright, "at least half of *the Ways and Means Committee* would have preferred to slap down the pesky Jackson-Vanik amendment before the trade bill reached the floor, but they did not dare".³⁴ All the same, two members of the Committee—James Corman (Democrat, California) and Jerry L. Pettis (Republican, California)—came forward with a "compromise formula" at the request of the administration. This would give the President the right to decide whether most-favored-nation status should be granted to whichever country. The Zionist lobby, however, succeeded in exerting such pressure on the authors of the "compromise" that the very next day they withdrew their proposal.

However, even in these conditions, Nixon and Kissinger refused decisively to oppose Jackson and his supporters. "Still the Administration continued to seek a compromise with Jackson," Kissinger writes in his memoirs. "Our first move was to gain time through a parliamentary maneuver: to eliminate all reference to MFN in the trade bill then before the House so as to eliminate the Jackson amendment with it. The idea was to force a conference between the Senate, which was expected to pass Jackson's amendment, and the House; in the conference we would then work out a compromise. It was a clever play thought up by our legislative liaison experts. It stood no chance. In fact, it demonstrated to what indirections our inability to fight the issue head-on had reduced us."³⁵

On September 26th, 1973, the Ways and Means Committee

with 18 (out of its 25 members) co-authors of the Vanik amendment passed it without a vote. It is significant that newly-appointed Secretary of State Kissinger, who had publicly committed himself to opposing the amendment nevertheless did not attend the hearings conducted by the Ways and Means Committee, although he had originally planned to appear there.

The war in October 1973 provided the conditions for the Nixon administration to toughen up its internal policy stance a little, including on the question of the Jackson amendment. On October 11th Kissinger called on the leaders of the House of Representatives to delay the vote on the trade bill "for the sake of top state interests", which was to have taken place a week later. Doubt also grew amongst the Zionist lobbyists as to whether the vote should be taken before it became clear whether Tel Aviv had changed its stance on this question, and they now concentrated their activity on securing unprecedented military aid for Israel.

On November 5th, 1973, Richard Maass, Jacob Stein, Charlotte Jacobson had a decisive meeting with Senator Jackson. Jackson also invited a number of his supporters, including Senator Ribicoff, David Blumberg, the president of B'nai B'rith, and all the members of the *Washington Group*. Joseph Albright wrote that "the meeting ended with Jackson, Ribicoff and Talisman (speaking for Vanik, who was out of town) telling the Jewish leaders unequivocally that they would press to have the amendment passed in both the House and Senate. . ."³⁶ "If we back down now, the Soviets will take advantage of it",³⁷ Jackson blackmailed his supporters, threatening publicly to expose their opposition to the amendment. Jackson and his supporters thus declared what amounted to an ultimatum on those Congressmen, and the sponsors of the amendment decided that "it was time for a show of strength" and resorted to open pressure on the White House: "Lowell of the National Conference sent word to about 25 top officers of the major Jewish organisations, asking them to send telegrams expressing outrage in the strongest possible terms to President Ford, with a copy of each to Kissinger. The object, according to one member of the Washington Group, was to make sure Ford knew he would be held directly responsible if the deal fell apart".³⁸

President Ford again met with Senator Jackson on Septem-

ber 20th, 1974 to discuss the "compromise", and on October 18th Jackson officially announced that he had reached an agreement with the administration which would include his amendment in the text of the trade bill. The President, however, was conceded the right to suspend the ban on granting the USSR credits and most-favored-nation status for a period of 18 months if he considered the Soviet Union to be executing the amendment's requirements. After that the President's actions would be subject to the annual approval of both Houses of Congress. In the absence of such approval either House would have the right to veto the President's actions within a period of 45 days.

This agreement was consolidated in Kissinger and Jackson's letters to each other ("The Pact of two Henrys"), which, in particular, contained the administration's assurance that the Soviet Union was allegedly ready to acknowledge the demands made on it concerning the conditions and volume of emigration. Here the administration consciously hid the fact that the Soviet side had decisively rebuked this attempt to interfere in its internal affairs in a letter from A. A. Gromyko to Henry Kissinger on October 26th, 1974.

When the Senate Finance Committee approved the bill together with its amendments on November 20th, 1974, having first demanded that Kissinger personally testify the "assurances" before the Senate discussed it, the Secretary of State resorted to direct misinformation. William Korey, one of the leaders of B'nai B'rith, noted: "The Gromyko letter was kept from the Senate, and the public. Kissinger made no reference to it during his crucial testimony in support of the Trade Reform Act before the Senate Finance Committee on December 3. He insisted that the use of the word 'assurances' in his letter to Jackson was based on solid evidence."³⁹ Apart from that, the Secretary of State gave the Senators to understand in his speech that they should not pay any attention to the public declarations of the Soviet side against the amendment, since these supposedly bore a propagandistic nature and did not reflect the true position of the USSR.

The administration's stance was aimed at turning the Jackson amendment into an effective instrument of interference in the internal affairs of the USSR. The "compromise" which Kissinger managed to reach did not alter the discriminatory provisions of

the Jackson amendment, but merely gave the administration the opportunity to use the amendment more resourcefully in its attempts to blackmail the Soviet Union.

This "compromise" met with full approval on the part of the Zionist and pro-Zionist circles of the Jewish community which had interpreted Kissinger's "assurances" as a recognition by the Soviet Union of "free emigration". The NCSJ announced its support for the Kissinger-Jackson agreement as early as November 8th, 1974, regarding it as a complete victory for the campaign "in defence of Soviet Jews". The disagreement between the supporters of a "rigid" backing of the agreement and those who favoured a more flexible course retreated into the background, and community leaders took a monolithic stance in favour of the Senate adopting the amendment.

Having created the impression that the "compromise" was acceptable to the Soviet Union, the administration at the same time effectively destroyed any opposition to the amendment in the Senate itself. The amendment was passed in the Senate on December 13th, 1974 by 88 votes to nil and, in fact, without having been discussed. The actual Trade Reform Bill was approved by 77 votes to 4. On December 20th the Senate and the House of Representatives finally approved the text of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment.

The 1974 Trade Reform Act and the story of its passage through Congress vividly showed that the opponents of detente, headed by Jackson, had used the question of the "position of Soviet Jews", which they had borrowed from Zionist circles, not so much to achieve "free emigration" as to hinder the development of Soviet-American relations in one of the most important fields, thus erasing much of the positive experience of the early 1970s.

In this way the significance of the anti-Soviet campaign under the libellous slogan of "defence of Soviet Jews" far exceeded the limits of the emigration question. In actual fact, an attempt was made to ruin the normalisation of Soviet-American relations and prevent the laying of solid foundations under the building of detente. In this the Zionist circles once again showed themselves to be an instrument of the most aggressive imperialist powers which did not wish to recognise the new correlation of forces in the world. The main groupings of the rul-

ing class in the USA did not want to give up their hegemonic claims and agree to the introduction of the principle of equal rights in their approach to the Soviet Union. Erroneous ideas about the aims and nature of Soviet-American detente even became spread amongst the realistically thinking circles of the American bourgeoisie, and this was just playing into the hands of those who wanted to follow a "tough line".

Zionist circles did American reaction an invaluable service by supplying the necessary slogans and developing tactics for a transfer to a counter-attack against detente.

However, the main role in pushing through the Jackson-Vanik Amendment was played by those circles connected with the military-industrial complex which opposed detente in principle. The Jackson-Vanik Amendment became a turning manoeuvre which allowed them to regroup their forces and win time for a frontal assault on detente. In the final analysis, Jackson and those who, like him, opposed detente, used the Zionists in their own interests, having taken their slogans as weapons and gained their support and means of exerting pressure. The adoption of discriminatory legislation gave the Zionist circles, in their turn, appreciable "dividends" in the American domestic political arena by strengthening their mutual relations with the supporters of the military-industrial complex. As far as the emigration of Soviet citizens to Israel is concerned, which Zionist circles secured in connection with the Jackson amendment, Jackson and his followers seriously miscalculated. The Soviet Union decisively rebuffed all attempts to interfere in its internal affairs.

THE ALLY OF THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

During the struggle to get the Jackson amendment adopted, Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations became significantly closer to the most reactionary forces in the American political arena. First of all the close co-operation of the pro-Israeli lobbyists with representatives of the military-industrial complex should be mentioned. Actively pushing through the programme of military aid to Israel, Zionist circles simultaneously played a noticeable

role in guaranteeing governmental foreign military aid programmes the necessary number of votes. From 1973 to 1975 these programmes had often been under threat of being blocked by Congress. For example, in individual instances aid to Israel and the South Vietnamese and South Korean regimes was combined in a single "package", which led to the "desertion" of some liberal supporters of Israel from the ranks of those who opposed dragging out the conflict in Indochina. The Israeli lobby also caused proposals on the withdrawal of some American troops from Western Europe to fail.

As early as 1974 the American journalist Saul Friedman reported on "... a swap between U.S. Jewish leadership and the Defense Department: support of a big budget for the Pentagon, something liberal-affiliated Organised Jewry usually opposes, in return for pledges to Israel from the U.S. government of a military, political and economic nature".⁴⁰⁻⁴¹ He noted that "the Jewish community was in a similar fix when the Johnson and Nixon administrations put pressure on Jewish leaders to moderate their opposition to the Vietnam war in exchange for support of Israel".⁴² Former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General George S. Brown openly recognised the "particular" effectiveness of the Zionist lobbyists in Congress. "We have the Israelis coming to us for equipment," he said. "We say we can't possibly get the Congress to support a program like that. They say, 'Don't worry about the Congress. We'll take care of the Congress'."⁴³

Taking the effectiveness of the Zionist lobbyists in Congress into account, the Pentagon and the State Department themselves frequently make use of their services to force through Congress some decision or other which is in the interests of the military-industrial complex. It is well known how the administration used the support of the Zionist lobby to get Congress to approve military aid to Turkey. What is less well known is that Zionist circles played an important role in the large-scale supply of arms to the Shah's regime in Iran. For example, during the discussion of the programme to sell Iran AWACS radar planes, Assistant Secretary of State Douglas J. Bennet sent out a confidential memorandum on August 19th, 1977 which provided for the mobilisation of the Israeli lobby in support of this programme.⁴⁴

Characterising the weight of Zionist circles in the American political arena, Gus Hall, the General Secretary of the Communist Party USA, wrote: "Reactionary political candidates who respond to the campaign get support from people who otherwise would not vote for ultra-right candidates.

"Because of this big lie the anti-Soviet campaign based in the Jewish communities affects the whole political spectrum."⁴⁵

The 1976 election campaign bears witness to the influence of Jewish bourgeois nationalists in the political life of the USA. During the Democratic Party primaries Zionist circles backed Senator Jackson from the very beginning. This representative of the military-industrial complex mainly used co-operation with Zionist lobbyists to broaden the financial base for his election campaign. Almost 80 per cent of the money he raised came from the leaders of the American Jewish community.⁴⁶ Under the influence of Zionist propaganda 49 per cent of voters of Jewish origin voted for Jackson in the Democratic primaries.⁴⁷ All the same, Jackson's campaign suffered shattering failure and Jimmy Carter, the little-known governor of Georgia who originally did not have any close ties with Zionist lobbyists, gained victory in the struggle within the Democratic Party.

Jackson's defeat in the primaries showed that the military-industrial complex and its Zionist allies were unable to secure the advancement of their candidate. In a number of pre-election speeches Jimmy Carter recognised the need comprehensively to regulate the Middle East conflict and, together with the Soviet Union, to call a Geneva Peace Conference. The former governor of Georgia demagogically spoke out on the rights of the Palestinians and even allowed himself to admit that it had been a mistake to tie the question of Jewish emigration from the USSR to trade legislation.

However, even on the eve of the Democratic Party conference, relations began to change between Carter and his entourage on the one hand, and Zionist lobbyists on the other. The leaders of Jewish bourgeois-nationalistic organisations began more and more to work on the new leader of the Democratic Party. The Zionist lobby in Washington, which had supported Richard Nixon, the Republican candidate, in 1972, soon began agitation in favour of Carter (George McGovern, also a Democrat, had

not seemed "tough" enough to the Zionist lobbyists, in spite of his pro-Israeli rhetoric).

Of course, President Carter was indebted to the support of a coalition of political forces reflecting the interests of the main groupings of the American ruling class for his victory at the elections in November, 1976. The Zionist circles in the Jewish community had merely facilitated a change of government in Washington, but had by no means determined it. It must not be forgotten in all this that, after certain failures at the beginning of the election campaign, the Zionist lobby quickly reorientated itself to Carter, who was the eventual victor of the pre-election fight, although they had not originally supported his candidacy.

The struggle around questions of foreign policy which unfolded in the American political arena after the Carter administration came in was not given a homogeneous evaluation in the American Jewish community. The majority of the Jewish population supported the policy of detente, including some representatives of the bourgeoisie and particularly those who had called for the Jackson amendment to be countermanded and supported the Committee for Agreement Between East and West. However, realistically thinking people formed but the minority in the communities' leadership, where representatives of Zionist and pro-Zionist circles enjoyed great influence.

There was a time when considerable anxiety was caused in Zionist circles by Carter's declarations concerning a regulation of the situation in the Middle East. In the summer of 1977 the Zionists began a campaign of exerting pressure on the White House with the aim of hampering its retreat from a pro-Israeli line. The campaign reached its climax on October 1st, 1977, with the publication of the Joint Soviet-American Declaration on the Middle East, which opened up the way to achieving a general and lasting regulation of the situation in that region, taking into account the interests of the Palestinian people.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith accused the administration as early as October 3rd of furthering a "strengthening of Soviet influence" in the Middle East. On October 12th, 1977, the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council (NJCRAC) sent out secret instructions to its constituent organisations. These instructions demanded that a regional or state-

wide conference be convened following the adjournment of Congress and that it be keynoted by Congressional spokesmen; that a delegation including non-Jewish public figures be sent to Washington D. C. to meet with Senators and Congressmen before adjournment; that a massive flow of letters to the White House in the coming weeks be systematically ensured; that speakers be placed before key local groups and parlor meetings be arranged by Jewish leaders among their peers in the power structure of the general community; that preparation and placement be stimulated of op-ed pieces by academicians and others with expertise on the Middle East; and that a steady stream of letters to newspaper editors be maintained, particularly from prominent local figures.*

In a report made by the NJCRAC on November 2nd, 1979, it was noted that measures against the Joint Declaration had been implemented in 92 towns and states. In the meantime the American Jewish Committee's National Executive Council declared that "a crisis of confidence in the administration's Middle Eastern policy has arisen among American friends of Israel."⁴⁸

Attacks on the Joint Soviet-American Declaration reached unprecedented scale even for the Zionist lobby. A well-organised wave of protests, demonstrations and speeches against the White House swept across the country, and many leaders of the administration hesitated as a result of this campaign of pressure. In a few days the administration renounced the stance set out in the Joint Soviet-American Declaration and took a completely opposite course aimed at encouraging a separate Egyptian-Israeli accord.

It would be wrong to consider this about-turn in Washington's policy the result only or primarily of pressure from Zionist circles. The Zionist lobbyists were not the only ones to oppose the Joint Declaration, but were joined by those reactionary American forces which incited the government to reject any co-operation whatsoever with the Soviet Union. Henry Jackson, Daniel Moynihan and leader of the AFL-CIO George Meany, the Committee on the Present Danger, reactionary emigrant organi-

* See: National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, October 12, 1977, *Summary of Guide to Action on Middle East*, N. Y., 1977.

sations, the leaders of the Republican Party and of faction groups of Democrats in Congress—such was the spectre of opposition to a comprehensive regulation of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

As time has shown, the leaders of the administration themselves by no means consistently supported the convocation of a Geneva peace conference in which all interested sides would participate. For Jimmy Carter the Joint Soviet-American Declaration was just one of his regular policy zigzags, which at the end of 1979 and the beginning of 1980 finally resulted in an open about-turn to a policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union. As on other questions, the Carter administration showed itself to be an unreliable partner on questions of regulating the Middle East situation, a partner guided not by a striving for detente and lasting peace, but by the self-seeking interests of American imperialism.

A COURSE TO CONFRONTATION

In this way, as in the case of Jackson amendment, anti-Soviet circles once again succeeded in getting Washington to refuse to fulfil its obligations to the USSR, which it had officially taken on itself. In the second half of the 1970s reactionary American circles headed by representatives of the military-industrial complex made a direct assault on detente, using the “experience” acquired during the struggle over the Jackson amendment. The campaign “in defence of Soviet Jews” resulted directly in a propagandistic wise over so-called “violations of human rights” in the USSR.

Zionist circles were active in this demagogic campaign started by the Carter administration. Just two weeks after the new administration came in, the American Jewish Congress and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith expressed their support for the White House's new attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union on the pretext of “defending human rights”. As Arthur J. Goldberg, the head of the American delegation at the Belgrade meeting frankly declared at the time, the aim of this campaign was “... to give hope to dissenters in the Soviet Union”⁴⁹. For the Belgrade Conference Zionist circles specially prepared a provocative report containing flagrant slan-

der of the USSR's policy, and a delegation of the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry was sent to the city.

At the beginning of 1979, when the congress of the 96th convocation was getting down to work, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry announced a new anti-Soviet campaign under the heading "Intervention-96". According to this campaign, each of the 100 Senators and 435 Congressmen was to take so-called "Jewish activists" in the Soviet Union under his "patronage". This provocative undertaking was initiated by eight active figures in the pro-Israeli coalition—four Senators (Democrats Claiborne Pell and Howard Metzenbaum and Republicans Richard Schweiker and Robert J. Dole) and four Congressmen (Democrats Sidney Yates and James Blanchard and Republicans Willis Gradyson and Jack Kemp). The Zionists also created a new organisation—the Congressional Wives Committee for Soviet Jewry—to attract American legislators more actively into this activity.

The Zionists and other anti-Soviets were particularly active in the USA in connection with the case of A. Shcharansky, who was convicted by a Soviet court of spying for a foreign state. Zionist propaganda libellously alleged that he had been convicted for "wishing to leave the USSR". In actual fact, he was a member of a group of "Jewish activists" together with Lerner, Rubin and certain other renegades in the service of the CIA. S. L. Lipavskii, a former member of this group, wrote in *Izvestiia*:

"To increase tension in relations between the USA and the USSR Lerner suggested secretly gathering information about Soviet defence establishments and enterprises in order to use this pretext to persuade Western firms to stop supplying technical equipment to the USSR. After leaving the USSR, Rubin was to conduct the relevant consultations on this question and inform Lerner.

"In August, 1976, a letter arrived from Rubin through the American correspondent Osnos, with a request to speed up the dispatch of this information in order to give a lift to the campaign to ban the sale of American equipment to the USSR. Although there was opposition to the gathering of such materials, since this constituted overt espionage, Lerner nevertheless

instructed Shcharansky and others to obtain the information he wanted and to send it abroad.

"It must be stressed that the question of rendering the Americans the necessary assistance in obtaining intelligence information on scientific, technical and military subjects, as well as on political questions, was always on the agenda. All these were focused on the help to CIA agents in Moscow under the guise of official functionaries, and support to the notorious Jackson amendment to the bill on trade with the USSR."⁵⁰⁻⁵¹

The Soviet court thoroughly examined the evidence concerning Shcharansky's having gathered information both personally and through accessories on the location and affiliation of defence industry enterprises and installations connected with them. Keeping to the conspiracy, he systematically passed all this information to foreign agents right up to his arrest in March 1977. The court was presented with a lot of evidence on Shcharansky's criminal activity, including a letter from a foreign intelligence agent telling him to gather secret information, and a special questionnaire with a list of intelligence questions. The court ascertained that he had prepared and sent abroad no less than 17 forged documents which were used in the West for purposes hostile to the Soviet state.⁵²

Making Shcharansky out to be a "victim of Soviet anti-Semitism", Zionist circles and their allies tried to use this lie to incite a new spiral of worsening of American-Soviet relations. The adventurist N. Stiglitz came to America from Israel who, under the name of Avital Shcharansky, was to make herself out to be his wife. She was not only used to appear at all kinds of anti-Soviet gatherings, but also to attract leaders of Congress and the administration into the campaign of provocation. Jimmy Carter himself publicly took Shcharansky under his protection, and both Houses of Congress adopted a resolution hypocritically expressing indignation at the "violation of human rights" that have allegedly taken place.⁵³

The aim of this campaign of provocation was to avert the abrogation of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, since a number of Congressional figures headed by Paul Findlay (Republican, Illinois), a member of the House of Representatives, had come out in favour in 1977-1978 of normalising trade and economic relations between the USA and the USSR. Moreover, the cam-

paign organised by the Zionists was used to curtail scientific and technical links between the USA and the Soviet Union. In July 1978, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations issued a joint statement calling on the administration "...to seek an immediate freeze of the export of American technology to the USSR".⁵⁴ This demand was supported by Senators Moynihan and Jackson, as well as by other representatives of the military-industrial complex on Capitol Hill. Under the thumb of the anti-Soviets, President Carter declared a ban on the sale of the Sperry Rand Univac computer to TASS. A number of trade unions and the National Academy of Sciences of the U.S. were also drawn into this anti-Soviet campaign.

Continuing their libellous campaign "in defence of Soviet Jews", Zionist circles above all aimed at keeping discriminatory measures in force against the Soviet Union in the trade and economic sphere. It was with this aim that pressure was brought to bear on those politicians who had favoured getting rid of obstacles to the development of American-Soviet relations. Fairly pointed clashes were even recorded in the very apex of the Jewish community between Zionists and those bourgeois circles who were interested in developing trade with the USSR. However, the Carter administration's refusal to back the abrogation of discriminatory amendments helped the Zionists and their allies to hinder progress in this area. By keeping the Jackson amendment in force it became easier for reactionary circles to prepare the ground for the President to declare the policy of economic sanctions against the Soviet Union in January 1980.

The Zionists also took a hand in the anti-Soviet campaign aimed at disrupting the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow by starting a rumour that Israel would not be allowed to compete. On this and other pretexts they tried to organise pressure on capitalist Jewish firms which had concluded contracts to supply goods for the Games, sell souvenirs and broadcast television programmes from the Olympics (Occidental Petroleum, Lazard Frères et Cie, Lehman Brothers, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and NBC TV). It should be noted, however, that the Zionists failed to enlist the support of the majority of the American Jewish community on this question.

As we can see, the Zionists continued to intensify their anti-

Soviet campaign during the Carter administration. In these conditions this campaign became the constituent element of the frontal assault of all reactionary forces in the USA on detente. It was already considered unnecessary to resort to concealing the sinister aims of the supporters of the cold war with forced questions of emigration and the such like. From now on the attack was directed against the very principle of peaceful co-existence of states with differing socio-economic structures. This was shown most graphically in the struggle around SALT-II. While both progressive forces and some realistically thinking representatives of the apex of the Jewish community came out in favour of ratifying SALT-II, the Zionist lobbyists operated through the Jewish Institute for National Defense, an organisation which sets itself two goals: to inform the Jewish community of the importance of strengthening the US's defence to ensure the survival of the USA and Israel, and to enlighten American public opinion on the geopolitical value of Israel to the USA as an outpost of Western interests in the Middle East. At a meeting of a group of leaders of Jewish bourgeois-nationalistic organisations with Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, which was organised by the Jewish Institute for National Defense in December 1979, they spoke out against SALT-II and expressed support for increasing the Pentagon's budget.

The role of Zionist and pro-Zionist circles showed itself particularly clearly in connection with the conference of signatory states to the Helsinki Agreement held in Madrid from 1980 to 1982. Trying to "bury" detente, reactionary circles in the USA and other Western countries spared no efforts to hinder the work of the Conference and use it to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Representatives of the Brussels Presidium of "conferences in defence of Soviet Jews" and anti-Soviets from B'nai B'rith and the NCSJ who had turned up in Madrid also worked in concert with them.

William Korey, the director of International Policy Research of the International Council of B'nai B'rith who has taken part in practically every one of the Zionists' anti-Soviet provocations in recent years, was named "our man in Madrid" in confidential reports to this organisation's International Council. Having arrived in the Spanish capital on November 13th, 1980, he began energetic work to push a forged document about "Soviet anti-

Semitism" through the international forum. Let us cite some excerpts from his weekly reports, which were supplied to the leaders of B'nai B'rith.

In Report No. 1 of November 16, 1980, Korey reported: "The speech of Griffin Bell, head of U.S. delegation was excellent and we had a small hand in pressing for inclusion, high up, of the Soviet Jewish emigration issue and of Shcharansky (in a detailed manner). Stanley Lowell* did the inside lobbying but I was pushing on the outside." In Korey's words, "his job" was to include these false problems in the text of American delegates' speeches at closed sessions of the Conference to which correspondents and the public were not admitted. "I shall have regular meetings with government professionals on what is and what is not being done," he reported. "On Tuesday, will have a long breakfast with Kampelman and hope to be filled in. We've talked several times and I have had a long lunch with Spencer Oliver of U. S. Helsinki Commission. Also long discussions with key staffers Guy Coriden and Meg Donovan. They're 'gung ho' on our issues and are determined to have it raised in every possible forum."

In Report No. 2 of November 19, 1980, Korey wrote about the measures taken by the lobbyists to turn the question of Soviet Jews into "... a central issue at the Madrid Conference". It was with this aim that a press briefing was held, which was attended by correspondents from Associated Press, UPI, Reuters, *The New York Times*, *Le Monde*, and West German, Spanish and Israeli newspapers.

"We are still trying to visit with every Western and neutral delegate to make certain that when matters reach the working group stage next week (November 24) on individual baskets—human rights, disarmament, economic matters—the USA will not be alone in taking a strong line ... concerning all aspects of the Soviet Jewish plight," Korey reported.

A number of representatives of Zionist and pro-Zionist figures also worked with Korey, co-ordinating anti-Soviet actions. "Jerry Goodman (National Conference on Soviet Jewry Director) arrives on Friday and Burt Levinson on Sunday," Korey

* President of the NCSJ.

wrote. "At their request, a private dinner has been arranged for the key figures in the U. S. delegation, especially including Congressman Dante Fascell and Senator Claiborne Pell. Prior to the dinner, we are entertaining twenty or so of a congressional delegation, . . . Spencer has arranged for me to have access (with a special badge) to the conference centre (although the sessions are closed)."

In report No. 3 of November 23, 1980: "Griffin Bell on Friday gave his second speech (the text of which I now have) to the closed plenary. It focused on scientific and economic exchanges. Twice he mentioned the Jewish issue, sharply criticizing the USSR." The lobbyists intended regularly to put pressure on the participants in the Conference: "Big plans are in the works for early December. December 4—Jewish community leaders from the various European countries will meet here with their respective governmental delegates. December 8-10 Chief Rabbis of European countries will do the same. December 10 (Human Rights Day) the parliamentarians (non-Jewish) of European countries will assemble to press the case for Soviet Jewry. Press Conferences are planned for each event." As it could be expected Avital Shcharansky also had come to Madrid.

In Report No. 4 Korey informed the International Council of B'nai B'rith with satisfaction that "the Soviet Jewish issue has surfaced far more effectively, far more often, and in a much more varied fashion than at Belgrade or at *any* international forum. . ." In his words, this ". . . is a reflection of the work and lobbying of the Brussels Praesidium, some of consequence of Max's (Kampelman—*S.R.*) personal interest." He went on, "Max Kampelman will be giving a major speech on Soviet anti-Semitism, drawing upon the 'Blue Book' material," which was prepared by Zionist masters of provocation.

With unconcealed satisfaction Korey reported that the American delegation had formed the closest of relations with the Zionist lobbyists: "Max Kampelman has been extraordinarily helpful in meeting for two long lunches with me. He has provided access to various sources and areas and his entire staff, especially Spencer Oliver and Meg Donovan, have been more than usually helpful . . . And I have neglected to discuss my numerous meetings with many members of the public U. S. delegation, in-

cluding Sol Chaikin, Amb. Leo Lerner, Julius Michaelson, and especially Ben Epstein."

To all the above it should be added that Max Kampelman, who headed the US delegation in Madrid after the Reagan administration came in, is himself one of the bourgeois-nationalistic apex of the American Jewish community, is a member of the leadership of a number of pro-Zionist organisations, and for many years personally took part in Zionist lobbying in the highest echelons of the American government.

Thus, in counterbalance to the constructive line taken by the USSR and other socialist countries, the USA and its NATO allies tried to block the solving of questions of security and co-operation at the Madrid Conference, and to turn the forum in the Spanish capital into an arena of ideological confrontation and use it to interfere in the internal affairs of socialist states. It was with these aims that an unprecedented attempt was made to stage a well-rehearsed show designed to disorient public opinion. As the facts indicate, Zionist circles played far from the smallest role in the organisation of this show, as a result of which and because of the destructive stance taken by the Reagan administration, the Madrid Conference failed to reach an agreement on its final document and specific measures to further detente and disarmament.

Zionists play a particular role in the so-called neo-conservative circles which are closely linked with the Reagan administration. Amongst the leaders of the neo-conservatives, such representatives of the Jewish bourgeois-nationalistic intelligentsia should be pointed out as Norman Podhoretz, the editor of *Commentary* magazine (published by the American Jewish Committee), and Irving Kristol, the editor of *Public Interest* magazine (published by the American Enterprise Institute). These figures play an active role in working out the political course of the reactionary forces of the monopolistic bourgeoisie of the USA. Their pro-Zionist stance goes with the propaganda course of building up the arms race and international tension, and towards a confrontation between Washington and the forces of socialism and national liberation.

Norman Podhoretz, for example, pushes the myth about a "Soviet threat" and tries to prove the need to return to the doctrine of "containing" the Soviet Union which arose during the

cold war. "... Far from being obsolete, the case for containment was even stronger now that the Soviet Union had become powerful enough to pose a serious threat to the democratic world than it had been in the days when we were so much more powerful than they," he wrote.⁵⁵⁻⁵⁶ In his words, support for the aggressive course of Israel is "inextricably" connected with American military superiority. He declares that "... hostility to anti-Communist interventionism was as dangerous to Israel as ... anti-Zionism".⁵⁷

THE JUNIOR PARTNER OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

Zionist circles have formed the very closest of links with the Reagan administration, which reflects the interests of the most reactionary circles of American monopoly capital. The platform of the Zionist allies of the White House was set forth in a political resolution adopted in May, 1982 at the annual Conference of the American Israeli Public Affairs Committee. Justifying the course of building up international tension and the arms race, this platform repeats the hackneyed fabrications about a "Soviet threat". "The United States should strengthen its defenses to check Soviet subversion and aggression in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and throughout the world,"⁵⁸ the Zionist lobbyists declare, using the standard selection of anti-Soviet slander which Washington spreads in order to hide its own plans for world domination. The Zionists are simultaneously trying to stir up a libellous campaign about non-existent "Soviet anti-Semitism" and demanding "an increase in the level of emigration" from the USSR.

Thus, the course of the Reagan administration, which is aimed at building up international tension and the arms race, receives the full support of the Zionists. They actively participate in Washington's efforts to interfere in the internal affairs of their nations. Subversive centres of Zionism joined, for example, the campaign to undermine the socialist order in Poland. Together with the secret services of the USA and other imperialist powers, "experts" on anti-socialist propaganda from Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations thought that they would be able to pull Poland out of the socialist community. After these counterrevo-

lutionary plans had failed, the Reagan administration unleashed an unbridled anti-Polish and anti-Soviet campaign.

The course of the ruling circles of the USA towards confrontation with the forces of peace and social progress has led to a tangible worsening of the situation in many regions of the world. In Central America, for example, Washington is interfering more and more in the internal affairs of El Salvador, Guatemala and other countries where the struggle of the peoples against oligarchic regime is intensifying. The Reagan administration has openly taken the side of the bloody dictators, with whom the Zionists have already been in close contact for a long time.

The pro-American regimes in Latin America and other areas of the world occupy a prominent place amongst the forty odd countries to which the Israeli Zionists sell arms. According to figures published in the press, Israel's arms exports reached 2,000 million dollars in 1982. The Zionist "death trade" boom began in the second half of the 1970s, when the Carter administration tried not to advertise American support for dictators. Each time the White House hypocritically expressed its "non-involvement" in the bloody crimes of anti-popular regimes and demonstratively declared the curtailment of American arms supplies, the Zionist "dealers in death" immediately appeared in the arena. Thus, in Nicaragua "in the last two years of Somoza's reign, when 500,000 Nicaraguan civilians were killed, 98 per cent of his arms came from Israel..."⁵⁹ The national guard was armed with Israeli submachine guns, armoured cars, artillery weapons and Arava planes, which proved to be most "effective" for bombing peaceful Nicaraguan villages and the poor areas of towns on the dictator's orders.

The Paraguayan dictator Alfredo Stroessner, the military fascist dictatorship in Guatemala and Augusto Pinochet, the butcher of the Chilean people—all number amongst the clients of the Zionist "dealers in death". During his visit to Chile in 1979, the then Deputy Minister of Defence of Israel, Mordechai Zippori, offered the junta comprehensive military aid. In accordance with one of the deals which were concluded the Chilean military purchased 1500 Israeli Shafir missiles with an infra-red homing system. As the London magazine *The Middle East* reported in September 1981, after the Guatemalan dictatorship took re-

prisals against students in 1979, Israel sold the military regime more than fifty thousand Galil assault rifles, fifteen transport planes and five troop-carrying helicopters.

Israeli arms and anti-guerilla experts played a particularly important role in the fight with partisans in El Salvador. While the Reagan administration did not decide to back out the game "in defence of human rights" and openly send American arms and military advisers to this country, support from the Zionists was of decisive significance for Salvadorian reaction.

These profitable deals with the Salvadorian and Guatemalan regimes were organised by Markus Katz, an Israeli citizen, who has already been living in Mexico for fourteen years, and who regularly travels to Israel with potential customers from Latin America.⁶⁰⁻⁶¹

The Zionists' links with the Republic of South Africa also play a special role. The Jewish community of this country has already firmly held on to first place in the amount of money collected for Israel (per head of population). Apart from that, uncut diamonds from the Oppenheimer mines in South Africa are treated in Israel, which is of great significance for both countries' economies. In recent years economic and technical co-operation has increased between Israel and South Africa, above all in the military field.

In South Africa production has been started under an Israeli licence of the Uzi submachine gun and certain other firearms, and Israel is assisting the South African aerospace industry in the production of the Mirage type planes, the technical specifications for which were stolen in France by the Zionist secret services. In their dockyards the South African racists are co-operating with Israeli specialists in building war boats and submarines.

Pretoria has become the main purchaser of Israeli weapons, buying, among other things, warships, missiles, and artillery weapons. In its turn, Tel Aviv has purchased British-built tanks in South Africa and then special types of steel to fortify their armour. Israel later rendered South Africa assistance to modernise the South African Army's tanks. In recent years joint enterprises have been set up to produce troop-carrying helicopters (in Israel) and radioelectronic equipment (in South Africa).

Reports about nuclear co-operation between Israel and South

Africa cause particular concern amongst the world public. Foreign specialists believe that Israel had already developed the technology to produce nuclear weapons in the 1960s. And in South Africa there are enormous deposits of nuclear raw materials. Close co-operation has been established between the faculty of nuclear physics at Johannesburg University and the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel. General A. Herev, the former director of the science department of the Israeli Ministry of Defence, publicly admitted his participation in the nuclear research being carried out in South Africa.

To all appearances, the mysterious explosion in the Southern part of the Atlantic Ocean in September 1979, which was picked up by an American intelligence satellite, was a nuclear weapon test. The majority of specialists believe that this test was conducted jointly by Israel and South Africa, both of whom refuse to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The nuclear ambitions of Tel Aviv and Pretoria bear a mortal threat for the peoples of Africa and the Middle East. The reality of this threat was emphasised by reports in the international press that the Israeli Zionists and South African racists are working together with the Taiwanese regime to develop nuclear weapons delivery vehicles—cruise missiles with a range of 2,500 kilometres.

South Africa and Israel have already been co-operating for many years in the fight against the national liberation movement of the African peoples. The Zionists sent specialists on combatting guerillas to South Africa and have rendered assistance to the South African authorities in developing a system of electronic surveillance equipped with Israeli devices on the border between Namibia and Angola. The South African military is adopting the Israeli tactics of permanent aggression against Lebanon in its undeclared war against Angola. In the autumn of 1981, Israeli Defence Minister Sharon, the leader of the Zionist "hawks", visited the South African racists to impart "experience".

The Israeli secret services took deep root in the "Bantustans" (homelands) created by the South African racists—mock states which had fictitiously been declared "independent". As the Paris magazine *Jeune Afrique* reported on June 2nd, 1982, Pretoria had instructed "specialists" from Tel Aviv to set up puppet police forces in the "Bantustans" of Bophuthatswana, Transkei, Siskei

and Venda. This task is being carried out by 150 Israeli officers in close contact with the secret service of South Africa. In the "Bantustan" of Bophuthatswana, for example, an Israeli general by the contrived name of David Isaacson "works" as a technical consultant to the puppet President Lucas Mangope.⁶² Bophuthatswana has a "commercial representation" in Israel, which is headed by a former adviser to the Israeli Prime Minister. At the end of 1980 Mangope himself travelled to Israel to ask for more "specialists" to be sent to his "country".

As is known, from the end of the 1950s to the beginning of the 1970s Israel gave "aid" to more than thirty African states. Zionist specialists trained many future military dictators of African countries and Israeli capital was actively invested in their economies. In 1973, however, most of them broke off diplomatic relations with Israel. The Zionists are today trying once again to break into Africa and thrust on it the "Israeli model of development", i.e. their own neocolonialist rule. Under pressure from the USA a number of pro-Western regimes have renewed contacts with Israel. There are four thousand Israeli consultants and experts operating in Black Africa today. In November 1981, General Sharon visited the Central African Republic, Gabon and Zaire, foisting Israeli weapons and military specialists on the Africans.⁶³

All this bears witness to the fact that Zionism is becoming an ever more dangerous weapon of aggressive imperialist circles, which are trying to unite all the forces of world reaction for the fight with the socialist community and the national liberation movement. Zionism has become the junior partner of American imperialism in the global strategy of ensuring Washington's domination of the world.

References

- 1-2. *Israel Pocket Library. History from 1980*. Keter Publishing House, Jerusalem, 1973, p. 38.
3. Christopher Sykes. *Crossroads to Israel*. Mentor, 1967, p. 22.
4. Martin Gilbert. *Exile and Return. The Emergence of Jewish Statehood*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1978, pp. 109-110.

5. Richard. P. Stevens. *Weizman and Smuts. A Study in Zionist-South African Cooperation.* The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1975, p. 35.
6. Ezekiel Rabinowitz. *Justice Louis D. Brandeis. The Zionist Chapter of His Life.* Philosophical Library, N.Y., 1968, pp. 112-113.
7. *Political Affairs*, July 1971, Vol. 50, No. 7, p. 20.
8. Arthur Hertzberg. *The Zionist Idea. A Historical Analysis and Reader.* Atheneum, N.Y., 1973, pp. 390-391.
9. Joseph B. Schechtman. *The United States and the Jewish State Movement. The Crucial Decade: 1939-1949.* Herzl Press, Thomas Yoseloff, N.Y., 1966, pp. 408-409.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 409.
11. See Howard M. Sachar. *A History of Israel. From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time.* Alfred A. Knopf, N.Y., 1979, p. 460.
12. See Melvin I. Urofsky. *We Are One! American Jewry and Israel.* Anchor Press, Doubleday Garden City, N.Y., 1978, p. 304.
13. Anthony Pearson. *Conspiracy of Silence.* London, 1978, p. 72.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
15. Alfred M. Lilienthal. *The Zionist Connection. What Price Peace?* Dodd, Mead and Company, N.Y., 1978, p. 567.
16. See *The Aims and Methods of Militant Zionism.* Politizdat, M., 1971, pp. 67-68, (in Russian).
17. *Izvestiia*, March 4, 1977.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *The White Book. Evidence, Facts and Documents.* Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1981, p. 186.
20. Gus Hall. *Imperialism Today.* International Publishers, N.Y., 1973, p. 167.
21. The Communist Party of Israel. *The 19th Congress. Haifa and Nazareth, 11-14 February 1981.* Tel Aviv, 1981, p. 252.

22-24. Arnold Foster and Benjamin R. Epstein. *The New Anti-Semitism*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, N.Y., 1974.

25. *The New York Times Magazine*, January 5, 1975, p. 20.

26. See Goldman N. *The Jewish Paradox*. N.Y., 1978, p. 180.

27. *The New York Times Magazine*, January 5, 1975, p. 22.

28. *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*. Vol. 2, A Warner Communication Company, N.Y., 1979, p. 418.

29. *American Jewish Year Book, 1974-1975*. Vol. 75, N.Y., 1975, p. 213.

30. Henry Kissinger. *Years of Upheaval*. Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1982, p. 250.

31. Ibid., p. 254.

32. *American Jewish Year Book, 1974-1975*. Vol. 75, N.Y., 1975, p. 216.

33. Gerald S. Strober. *American Jews: Community in Crisis*. Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1974, p. 68.

34. *The New York Times Magazine*, January 5, 1975, p. 26.

35. Kissinger H. op. cit., p. 990.

36. *The New York Times Magazine*, January 5, 1975, p. 28.

37. Ibidem.

38. *The New York Times Magazine*, January 5, 1975, p. 31.

39. *American Jewish Year Book, 1976*. Vol. 76, The American Jewish Committee, N.Y., 1975, p. 163.

40-41. *Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 17, 1974.

42. Ibidem.

43. Lilienthal A. op. cit., p. 445.

44. *Washington Post*, September 10, 1977, p. A15.

45. Gus Hall. op. cit., p. 168.

46. See *The New York Times Magazine*, November 23, 1975, p. 56.

47. See Lipset S. (ed.) *Emerging Coalitions in American Pol-*

itics. San Francisco, Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1978, p. 140.

48. *American Jewish Year Book 1979*, Vol. 79, N.Y., The American Jewish Committee, 1978, p. 167.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

50-51. *Izvestiia*, March 4, 1977.

52. See *The White Book*. pp. 220-226.

53. See *American Jewish Year Book 1980*, Vol. 80, The American Jewish Committee, N.Y., 1979, p. 125.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 126.

55-56. Norman Podhoretz. *Breaking Ranks. A Political Memoir*. Harper and Row Publishers, New York, London etc., 1979, pp. 348-349.

57. *Ibid.*, p. 351.

58. *Near East Report*, May 14, 1982, Vol. XXVI, No. 20, p. 95.

59. *Middle East International*, No. 153, July 3, 1981, p. 9.

60-61. See *Middle East*, No. 83, September 1981, p. 24.

62. See *Jeune Afrique*, 26 Juillet 1982.

63. *Middle East International*, No. 176, June 4, 1982, p. 12.

THE MIDDLE EAST
SETTLEMENT IN THE
CONTEXT
OF SOVIET-AMERICAN
RELATIONS AND
THE ACTIVITIES
OF INTERNATIONAL ZIONISM

For decades the situation in the Middle East has resembled a pendulum movement. Its non-stop swings were activated by changes in the home affairs and in the correlation of the class and political forces in the region, the ups and downs in the nationalist sentiment, the ebb and flow in the Arab national liberation movement, and by the effect of the USSR and USA policies. The extent of the latter impact was largely determined by the degree in which the great powers' moves corresponded to the national aspirations of the countries and peoples of the region. As a rule, the US moves, dictated by the need to back up the annexation policies of Israel, its strategic ally in the region, clashed with the national interests of the peoples in the region. The latest example and proof of this has been the abrogation by the government of Lebanon of the degrading agreement with Israel, whose crushing terms had been directly drawn up by the US diplomacy.

Consequently, the growing nationalist sentiment in the Arab world, its evolution and the growing awareness by the Arabs of their national current and long-term political objectives must be taken into account by all observers of the Middle East situation. Disregard of these sentiments showed by the US Administration providing all-round military and political support to Israel, sometimes even contrary to the USA's own interests, is the cause of the unpopularity, to say the least, of official Washington's policies in the Middle East. Driven by their hegemonic aspirations, and nurturing far-reaching designs of military and political character, US strategists tend to forget that at this stage of the Arab world's development nationalism largely remains a motive force, a political doctrine and praxis of a broad spectrum

of class and political forces including those in power in Arab countries. This brings to one's mind the strikingly up-to-date comment of Lenin's that there is always a broader democratic content in the nationalism of an oppressed nation.

It is highly symptomatic in this connection that recent US political initiatives in the Middle East caught the Arabs' attention only when they contained at least a hint of the US preparedness to consider such aspects of the Middle East settlement vital for the Arabs as the Palestinian Arabs problem, the discontinuation of the building of Israeli settlements, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories, etc. However, these initiatives drew heavy criticism of the Arabs as soon as, after a short lapse of time, it became clear that they contain nothing new and revolve in the vicious circle of old and stale anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian, i.e. pro-Israeli, stereotypes of the US Middle East policy.

It follows that when the US diplomacy refused to take into account the nationalist sentiments in the Arab world it committed a serious error. An example of this unsound approach is provided by attempts to carry on extending a "special" US-Israeli relationship under the conditions of the growing dependence of the USA and the West on the oil and petrodollars owned by conservative Arab regimes, who are Israel's avowed political enemies. These moves on the part of the USA is closely connected with its constant attempts to make use of anti-communism which, by and large, is not very characteristic of the majority of Arab nationalists.

It is difficult to discern changes and new trends in the world through the spectacles of "global confrontation" with the Soviet Union. To see communist plots and "the hand of Moscow" everywhere and to blame "the Reds" for all developments which do not fit in with official Washington's Procrustean bed means to return to the outdated Cold War techniques and to miss the true essence of the Middle East realities and their dynamics can hardly be called statesmanship or political wisdom.

The instigators, authors and executors of the US Middle East policy made their second serious error when they persisted in their blind certitude that, using a large arsenal of military and political tools, including ostentatious arm-twisting and economic blackmail, and all-round "assistance" of the world Zionism and

Israel, the United States will ultimately succeed in ousting the Soviet Union from the Middle East and in keeping it away from the settlement process and establishing a *Pax Americana* in the region.

Has the US Administration scored any successes along this road? Appearances may be deceptive. Were the Camp David deal and the Israeli-Egyptian accord of 26 March 1979 a success or a failure? It has become obvious that these arrangements could not and did not bring a solution to the problem of a just and stable peace in the Middle East, because they threw the settlement process back and created new obstacles in the way of the world community's collective efforts to achieve a comprehensive Middle East settlement. These moves of the US diplomacy made the US Middle East policy dependent on sudden unpredictable turns and surprises in which modern Arab history has been so rich. One of such surprises was the violent departure of President Sadat, America's most reliable ally in the Arab world. An unbiased observer will admit that the tragic end of the former Egyptian president's political career was an inevitable consequence of his unchecked following of US advice on the country's foreign and home policy. Sadat's sudden departure from the Middle East's political arena demonstrated the fragility of the strategic structure of the US Middle East policy and the unsoundness of the tactical methods of implementing it.

These developments have prompted certain US politologists to pose the question: Would it not be better to search for a way out of the Middle East conflict by putting forward proposals acceptable to the Soviet Union, whose role in the region remains substantial and in the solution of many elements of the crisis situation even a decisive one. To claim that the Soviet Union is doomed to "rearguard action" in the region is tantamount to ignorance, to say the least, of the characteristic trends in the development of the Arab world in the first half of the 1980s. A student of the Middle East settlement in the context of Soviet-American relations during the past few years immediately wonders: Is Soviet-American cooperation in searching for a way out of the Middle East crisis possible and on what terms?

During the past 35 years there have been sporadic instances of such cooperation or, as a minimum, parallel Soviet-American actions in the Middle East. Both the USSR and the USA pro-

ceeded from the need to recognise the rights of the Jewish and Arab residents of Palestine under the British mandate to create their own independent states. The UN General Assembly Resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 laid down the progressive constitutional groundwork for the future Arab and Jewish state entities, established procedures for their creation which precluded any infringements, especially with respect to the rights of ethnic and religious minorities. The resolution called on the two future states to commit themselves to a peaceful foreign policy. It stipulated a number of conditions on the fulfilment of which depended the recognition of the two would-be states by the United Nations. Beyond any doubt, if the implementation of the resolution had not been torpedoed by the Palestinian war immediately following the proclamation of the state of Israel, as a result of which the territory destined for the Arab state was divided among Israel, Jordan, and Egypt, the Middle East conflict would not have acquired so dangerous proportions and Israel would not be able to pursue a permanent annexationist policy and to hold the region in a constant state of tension.

The US endorsement of the 29 November 1947 UN General Assembly resolution was one of the few manifestations of the US Administration's preparedness during the Cold War to search for solutions of international disputes at the negotiating table. However, Washington's moves to establish a "special" relationship with Israel could not fail to undermine stability in the Middle East. Israel's aggressive foreign policy, which was made possible by the all-round support of the West, primarily the USA, corresponded to the interests of the leaders of international Zionism who, far from seeking reconciliation of Israel with its Arab neighbours, whetted the annexationist appetites of Israel's leadership and actively promoted the idea of creating "Greater Israel" at the expense of the neighbouring Arab territories. This gradually led many Arab leaders to the realisation of the need of cooperation with the Soviet Union. The Arab nationalists' natural desire to seek economic and political independence made them dangerous enemies and even "agents of world communism" in the eyes of the US Administration.

In the second half of the 50s and the first half of the 60s the US Administration believed that the Soviet Union's moves to promote Soviet-Arab relations jeopardised US interests in the

region and posed a threat for pro-Western Arab regimes. In reality the Soviet Union decided to render broad political, military, diplomatic, and economic assistance to many Arab countries which stepped on the road of independent development motivated by the desire to help them in the development of their key economic sectors and the creation of a state-owned sector (it is worth recalling in this connection of the US refusal to finance the construction of the Aswan High Dam in Egypt), and not by any "subversive" designs.

The military setback of the three Arab countries, Egypt, Syria and Jordan, as a result of the June 1967 Israeli aggression against them, could not halt the process of national and social liberation in the Arab East, but it did strengthen the positions of those political forces which considered an alliance with the West and an end to cooperation with the Soviet Union an indispensable condition of attaining by the Arabs of a suitable settlement of their conflict with Israel. The idea that Washington holds the key to the settlement was taken up by those Arab statesmen who followed in the footsteps of the 1935-1936 French bourgeoisie. Similarly to the French right-wing quarters which in the mid-30s proclaimed 'mieux Hitler que le Front Populaire' (better Hitler than the Popular Front), after the June 1967 war the ruling quarters of certain Arab countries went on record with increasing frequency that anyone is preferable to Nasser, for the then Egyptian President embodied for many of them the anti-Western main thrust of the Arab nationalism's ideology and political praxis.

During the search for a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, which was aggravated by the Israeli 1967 seizure of a number of Arab territories, there were attempts to come up with a joint US-Soviet approach to the resolution of a number of concrete questions of the Middle East settlement, such as talks between US President Johnson and Soviet Premier Kosygin in Glassboro and the several rounds of consultations and talks which followed the unanimous adoption by the UN Security Council of the Resolution 242 of 22 November 1967 for which both the USSR and the USA voted. At the time, the Soviet-US negotiations on the Middle East took place in a situation difficult for the USA and the USSR. It was difficult for the USA because Washington's prime foreign policy concern was the Vietnam war, and

it was difficult for the USSR because, primarily concerned with the need to secure the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied territories, the leaders of the Arab countries which were victims of the 1967 Israeli aggression were largely not receptive to Soviet advice on other, no less important aspects of the settlement problem: the need to search for a constructive solution of a Palestinian problem, the importance of recognising the fact of Israel's existence, etc. Refusing to accept the provisions of the UN Security Council's Resolution 242 and shaping its policies correspondingly, Israel's leadership aggravated the situation and heightened the tensions in the region. The anti-Soviet and anti-Arab actions of international Zionism acquired unprecedented proportions, along with the Zionist pressure on the White House.

The cause of the settlement was hardly helped by the openly pro-Israeli character of a number of American moves at the time and the complete absence of a will to search for a balanced solution in official Washington which manifested itself in the undisguised negative attitude to the Soviet proposals of 31 December 1968, 17 June 1969, and those made at quadripartite consultations in the Security Council in the spring-autumn of 1969, at the multi-stage Soviet-American consultations in the spring of 1969 in Washington and in the summer of 1969 in Moscow, during the visit of Deputy Secretary of State Sisko, and in the autumn of 1969 in New York and Washington.

A typical example of the US position at the time was the so-called Rogers Plan—a ceasefire (on the Suez Canal) and "the freezing of the situation". Explaining the provisions of the plan, the then US Secretary of State pointed out that "to call for Israeli withdrawal as envisaged in the UN resolution without achieving agreement on peace would be partisan toward the Arabs. To call on the Arabs to accept peace without Israeli withdrawal would be partisan toward Israel". He added that, "a peace agreement between the parties must be based on clear and stated intentions and a willingness to bring about basic changes in the attitudes and conditions which are characteristic of the Middle East today".¹ Moscow assessed the Rogers Plan as a departure of sorts by Washington from the openly pro-Israeli position.

Egypt is known to have accepted the Rogers Plan, which

provoked a wave of protest in the Arab world and especially among the Palestinian Arabs. Before deciding to accept the plan President Nasser held consultations with the Soviet leadership. If Moscow had really believed that anything emanating from Washington is evil, the Soviet Union would certainly have been capable of preventing Egypt from accepting the Rogers Plan. The Soviet Union, however, refrained from adopting such a simplistic attitude, because it had always proceeded from the fact that each step designed to reduce the tensions in the Middle East dangerous for the world peace no matter where it originated from, ought not to be rejected out of hand but must be carefully studied and taken into account in specific policy moves.

All attempts, therefore, to ascribe expansionist designs vis-à-vis the Middle East to the Soviet Union or accuse it of trying to reach a settlement which would give it "unilateral advantages" would be in bad faith. The principle of justice for all has always been the fundamental one in the Soviet Middle East policy. This much has been recognised even by the leaders of Israel, a country with which the USSR severed diplomatic relations on 10 June 1967.

The shortlived drawing closer of the USSR and US positions on the basis of the approval by both of the UN Security Council Resolution 242 gave way to a long period of diplomatic manoeuvring during which the positions of the two countries drew wide apart again. After 1967, aware that the abnormal situation in the Middle East, described as "neither war, nor peace", might ultimately bring about a new outbreak of hostilities, the Soviet Government repeatedly called on the US Administration to show itself equal to the enormous responsibility which rests on the great powers in the matter of the Middle East settlement. The May 1972 and June 1973 Soviet-American summits showed that Washington was not particularly concerned about the Middle East situation and viewed the negative impact of the Israeli occupation of Arab lands on the domestic politics in a number of Arab countries as a gratuitous possibility of pressuring these countries into taking decisions suitable for the West.

In these conditions the leadership of Israel and international Zionism maintained its openly obstructionist stand towards a Middle East settlement, continuing to disregard numerous res-

olutions of the UN Security Council and the General Assembly and doing everything to upset all efforts of the international community aimed at a just political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The continuing tensions and instability in the region looked as an anachronism against the background of a turn towards detente in international relations in 1972-1973.

Mounting tensions in the Middle East added fuel to the growing and ever wider discontent in the Arab world about the Arab governments' reluctance to use force to resolve once and for all the key questions of the settlement, that of the Israeli troops' withdrawal from the occupied Arab lands. The appeals to find a cardinal military solution to the Middle East problem were not accidental. In other words, the talk about the need for armed struggle against Israel was moved to a practical plane and willingly or unwillingly pushed the Arab leaders toward resolute measures in the Middle East settlement.

The October War could have taken place earlier. Even casual observers of the Middle East affairs had no doubts that a new Arab-Israeli war, a much more bitter and destructive one than the three preceding ones, would break out sooner or later. It was hardly to be expected that the Arabs would reconcile themselves to the usurping of their rights and the seizure by Israel of territories which had been theirs from time immemorial.

Against a broader background of contemporary international relations the events of October 1973 in the Middle East were, as it were, the most serious test of the viability and soundness of the USSR's consistent policy of international detente. It is clear that the consequences for the world would have been disastrous had it not been for the favourable prerequisites that had shaped by that time for better Soviet-US relations and the positive changes in them as a result of the talks of Soviet leaders with President Nixon in 1972-1973. It was brought home to the world that the USSR and the USA were not the only ones to benefit from a normalisation and improvement of the Soviet-US relations. This process creates qualitatively new conditions for the development of contemporary international relations, when the still smouldering seats of military tension can and must be eliminated by joint efforts of the great powers. The process of international detente and positive shifts in US-Soviet relations during

October 1973 events were subjected to a serious test and stood it well.

It is to be deplored that the past tense has to be used when speaking of the process of the improvement of Soviet-American relations. Blinded by pathological anti-Sovietism, the Reagan Administration has driven away the very thought of such an improvement.

Immediately following the end of the October War in the Middle East, on the initiative of the USSR and the USA and as a result of the talks between Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and the Soviet leaders in Moscow, the Security Council adopted several important resolutions including Resolution 338 on the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East. Kissinger's Moscow visit was crowned with an agreement on the Soviet-US co-chairmanship at the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. The significance of the Soviet-US co-chairmanship at the conference lies in the fact that the two countries committed themselves and showed preparedness to jointly influence the developments in the Middle East and the progress at the Geneva Peace Conference in order to enable the belligerents to attain a reasonable and mutually acceptable solution over the whole range of the settlement problems, not only that of troops disengagement. Closely related to the co-chairmanship problem was the question of the future Soviet-American guarantees of the settlement which were to become part and parcel of the settlement process and be included as such in the documents which would provide the institutional framework for the settlement in accordance with international law.

The Soviet Union felt that the main purpose of the Geneva Peace Conference was precisely to work out documents which would be binding on all sides in the conflict and create a firm groundwork for the Middle East settlement under international law. The implementation of these documents which, it goes without saying, had to be acceptable for all interested parties, could create conditions for a durable and stable normalisation of the Middle East situation.

Such a course of events, however, was not to the liking of Israel's leaders. It seemed that Egypt's and Syria's military potential, restored with Soviet assistance, the greater combat readiness of their armed forces, and Israel's grave losses in the October

War seemingly kept the Israeli leaders from overt moves to torpedo the efforts aimed at building balanced peace in the Middle East. Such a view, however, proved to be misleading. It became known later that on the eve of the opening of the Geneva Conference on 20 December 1973 Israel and the USA reached a confidential arrangement under which the US side committed itself to consulting Israel on all matters concerning its interests and to bring its stand at the conference in full accord with Tel Aviv's line.

However, no one knew about the arrangement at the time and as a result optimism reigned in the corridors and halls of the Geneva Palais des Nations.

One might wonder: why did Israel decide to attend the Geneva Conference at all? Was this a proof of its renunciation of its policy of annexation and aggression towards its Arab neighbours? It is common knowledge that the October War was a serious blow to the myth of the Israeli army's invincibility. The Arab leaders' stand was that the Geneva Conference was not talks between the victors and the defeated but between equal partners who seek peace in the region. However, peace on a mutually acceptable basis was not something that the Israeli leadership really wanted. Although after the October War the positions of political forces in Israel which voiced preparedness to seek and to find a way out of the conflict with the Arab neighbours grew stronger, Israel's leadership did not part with its far-reaching annexationist designs, and a certain drawing closer of the USSR and US positions on the situation in the Middle East, and ways of normalising it, did not suit it at all.

However, the drawing closer of the USSR and US positions on the settlement was a shortlived one. Doctor Kissinger's highly publicised step by step policy adopted by the US Administration was nothing but an attempt to impose separate deals with Israel on the Arabs, something the Soviet side naturally could not accept. Moscow correctly saw through the 'shuttle diplomacy' as an undisguised attempt to keep the Soviet Union out of the settlement process. The US side did not even think it necessary to try to convince the Soviet side to the contrary.

More than that, the Camp David deal confirmed the Soviet Union's worst misgivings, namely that official Washington would consider "the Camp David peace-building process" as a sort of

“a peak” of efforts to establish constructive peace in the region. This is what really happened. The US Administration found itself a hostage of its own propaganda which claimed that Camp David had brought long sought peace to the Middle East and that the rest was a matter of technique.

In reality genuine peace in the Middle East is even further off today than at the time of the signing of the Camp David accords, while “the peaceful victory” of Carter, Begin, and Sadat only added to the tensions in the region. This view has been borne out by the summer 1982 Israeli aggression against Lebanon and new outbreaks of violence in Lebanon as a consequence of the US and Israeli interference in the internal affairs of that country, as well as several other developments. The US military build-up in the Middle East, numerous demonstrations of the US naval and air strength in the area, and attempts at joint US-Israeli military and political pressure on Syria are hardly conducive to the normalisation of the situation in the region.

Unfortunately, after Camp David, most US experts in the Middle East, scholars and practical workers alike, adopted a view that the Soviet Union’s Middle East policy stands in the way of efforts (one might wonder whose efforts) to establish constructive peace there. Writings by US authors on the mythical “Soviet threat” to the Middle East are as many as they are lacking in substantive proof. The alleged threat was the main topic of Alexander Haig’s talks with certain Arab leaders in the spring of 1981 during which the US Secretary of State tried to talk his interlocutors into accepting the “strategic consensus” idea, that is an alliance of the region’s conservative regimes on an openly anti-Soviet basis.

Making much of the alleged Soviet threat in talks with Arab statesmen and in its propaganda campaign, the USA proceeds from a patently unsound premise that the Camp David “lock-pick” in combination with the Reagan Plan, which immediately followed the Israeli aggression in Lebanon in September 1982, can bring about a radical change in the Middle East and create a situation there which would be favourable for the implementation of Washington’s imperial ambitions and suitable to its main strategic ally—Israel. US officials and politologists specialising in Middle Eastern affairs repeatedly went on record to this effect. One of them, Professor of the University of Chicago Leonard Bin-

der, wrote in *Current History*, "The rationale for our emerging Middle East policy is to prevent the Soviet Union from challenging American political predominance in the region. We do not wish to share power or responsibility in the region with the Soviet Union. We should like to make sure that the countries allied with the Soviets switch to our camp or are prevented from exercising any influence beyond their boundaries. . . We should like to see a comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute, but we do not wish to pursue such a solution in an international forum in which the Soviet Union would enjoy equal status with us."²

US officials repeatedly expressed themselves in the same vein. "It is the Soviet presence in the Middle East which most concerns us now," stressed, for example, Under-Secretary of Defence for Policy Fred C. Ikle. "Our objective now is to confront this situation, and effectively to develop and deploy countervailing power. We wish ultimately to stand there, and from there to project force against those who invaded Afghanistan."³ Using the pretext of the alleged "Soviet threat" and fully backed up by Israel's leadership in a relapse of the Cold War syndrome, the USA tries to set up its military bases in the Middle East and to create a military infrastructure there which is far in excess in the military requirements of the states in the region and is spearheaded against the USSR.

However, these attempts have run into the opposition of not only the peoples but also many leaders of the Middle East states, who are aware that by making military concessions to the United States they would automatically set off their countries to the Soviet Union, subjecting them to a grave military and political risk.

It might be objected that the US side did take steps which could be described as preparedness to search jointly with the Soviet Union for a way out of the Middle East crisis. One of such steps, according to many observers, was the Joint Soviet-American Statement on the Middle East of October 1977. True, this document does not fit the, alas, familiar pattern of the traditionally pro-Israeli US Middle East policy. The document said among other things that constructive efforts of the USSR and the USA were necessary to build peace in the region on an equitable basis acceptable to all.

It would seem that if the Israeli leaders really wanted balanced

peace in the Middle East they should have hailed this document. However, that was not the reaction of official Israel and the leadership of international Zionist organisations.

Israeli leadership assessed the statement as a national catastrophe. Menachem Begin was promptly hospitalised, which, according to his physician, was a consequence of the Soviet-American statement.

An extraordinary session of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations was urgently convened in the USA. In a cable to Secretary of State Cyrus Vans, Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, Chairman of the Conference, described the statement as "an abandonment of America's historic commitment to the security and survival of Israel".⁴ A group of pro-Israeli senators: Moynihan, Dole, Jackson, Javits, Case and Baker expressed concern over the Soviet-American statements.

The Carter Administration's capitulation before the country's Zionists was prompt and across the board. Four days later the talks between Dayan and President Carter were followed by the so-called US-Israeli working document which fully nullified the Soviet-American agreement of October 1.

The political horizon has been overcast ever since, and for many years already there has not been a ray of light in the Soviet-American cooperation in the Middle East, largely owing to the Zionists' efforts. As before, those in Washington's corridors of power are actively debating the need for a "strategic consensus" of the pro-Western Arab regimes and Israel on an openly anti-Soviet basis. The Reagan Administration relegated to oblivion President Nixon's piece of advice given at the 25th (anniversary) Session of the UN General Assembly in September 1970 and which has lost none of its topicality: "It is essential that we and the Soviet Union join the efforts towards avoiding war in the Middle East and also towards developing a climate in which the nations of the Middle East will learn to live and let live. It is essential, not only in the interest of the people in the Middle East themselves, but also because the alternative could be a confrontation with disastrous consequences for the Middle East, for our nations, and for the whole world."⁵

The following question, important from the practical and theoretical standpoints suggests itself: Why was the US Administration prepared at certain periods to take joint steps with the

Soviet Union in the Middle East settlement and to what degree was this preparedness genuine? The answer in all probability would be as follows: when the makers and the executors of the US Middle East policy saw that it entered into a contradiction, dangerous for the US, with the Middle East realities, something fraught with a complete loss of the US positions in the region, when even most reliable US allies in the region refused to do Washington's bidding, when the US policy in the region showed patent weaknesses, only then did Washington recall that by paying lip service to meeting the Soviet position half-way it is easy "to let off steam" and to convince the world and Arab public that the USA is prepared to cooperate with the USSR in attaining peace in the Middle East.

There are numerous examples of this approach: the US representative cast his vote for the UN Security Council Resolution 242 only when the Arabs' indignation with Israel's refusal to withdraw its troops from the territories occupied in 1967 reached a critical point; agreement on joint action with the USSR within the framework of an international conference was reached only when the outcome of the October War largely shook the myth of Israel's military "invincibility" and gave the Arab peoples confidence that through joint efforts and unity on an anti-imperialist basis they can and must compel Israel give up its policies of annexation and war towards its Arab neighbours; the Soviet-US 1 October 1977 statement on the Middle East was an undisguised attempt by the US side to divest itself of responsibility for its traditionally negative attitude to the Palestinian settlement which remains the heart of and the key to the entire Middle East settlement.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the above discussion:

1. Preparedness for joint positive actions with the USA in the Middle East has been a permanent factor of the Soviet policy in this hot spot of the planet. At the same time Washington's claim to be the only "mediator" in the Middle East conflict and its intention to build up its military presence in the region with a view to imposing a *Pax Americana* on the Arab countries, to provide all-round support to any actions by Israel and to transfer the Middle East conflict into the sphere of "global Soviet-American confrontation" is a political vicious circle with no

visible way out. The US Administration's desire to exploit the Camp David accords "to the hilt" is in conflict with the real political trends in the region and doomed to failure.

2. The six points of the Soviet position, set forth on 15 September 1982⁶ remain the foundation of the Soviet Middle East policy. An impartial observer will agree that in their entirety they are based on the principle of equality for all. This principle must underlie an equitable, comprehensive, and lasting Middle East settlement.

3. A practical consequence of the US failure to act on the mentioned agreements with the Soviet Union on certain aspects of the Middle East situation is that morally, politically, and legally the Soviet Union can consider itself free of any commitments with respect to the USA on bilateral and multilateral agreements and arrangements on the Middle East settlement, and as a consequence the Soviet side would be justified to take any action in the region regardless of Washington's reaction. In other words, if the USA continues to break "the rules of the game" and seek to undermine the positions of the Soviet Union and its friends in the Middle East, nothing will prevent the USSR to take steps which would make the position of the USA and its friends and allies in the region a critical one.

It seems that obsessed with its desire to curb the Arab national liberation movement and to split it from other progressive forces, Washington has lost touch with the Middle East realities and is blind to the fact that the region is on the threshold of serious class, political, and social change, that it is ripe for the collapse of outdated political and state and legal structures and that this collapse will inevitably create conditions which will spell the end of imperialism's and Zionism's plans to perpetuate Middle East as their "reservation".

4. One of the prime objectives of Israel and international Zionism is to prevent the drawing closer of the USSR and the USA positions on the Middle East settlement and to keep the region in a permanent state of tension. Israel's leadership warns the US Administration that a Soviet-American "condominium" in the Middle East would inevitably result in the weakening of Israel, without whose support the entire US Middle East policy would collapse like a house of cards. As a result, the leadership of Israel and international Zionism have a particular stake in

preserving permanent tensions in the Middle East. These tensions in turn help the US leadership to use the pretext of countering "Soviet threat" in order to build up US military presence in the region, which is fraught with grave consequences for peace in the world.

References

1. Quoted from *The Department of State Bulletin*, 1970, Vol. LXII, No. 1593, January 5, pp. 8, 9.
2. Leonard Binder, "United States Policy in the Middle East; Toward a Pax Saudiana", *Current History*, 1982, Vol. 81, No. 471, January, p. 42.
3. *Address by Fred C. Ikle, Under-Secretary of Defense for Policy, before the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee*, May 18, 1981, Official Text, May 20, 1981, p. 3.
4. *The New York Times*, October 3, 1977, p. 6.
5. UN General Assembly, Session 25th, N. Y., 1970, Official Records, Vol. II, 1974, p. 6.
6. *Pravda*, 16 September 1982.

L. Dadiani

ZIONIST-ISRAELI HEGEMONISM: PAST AND PRESENT

In its 14 December 1979 resolution On the Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations the UN General Assembly condemned, among other forms of regional hegemonism, the adventurist expansionist policies of Israel's ruling quarters in the Middle East. For many decades Zionists have sought to impose their hegemony on the region and win a special role for themselves in the solution of regional problems. In the conduct of this hegemonic policy Zionist leaders make active use of a ramified network of international Zionist organisations associated with the World Zionist Organisation—the Jewish Agency for Israel (WZO—JA) and the World Jewish Congress (WJC).* The Zionist-Israeli hegemony has its ideological roots in the Zionist dogma about the existence of an extraterritorial, "special", "world Jewish nation", about the Jews being "God's chosen people", the special historic predestination of the Jews and "anti-Semitism's primordiality".

"We might boast of some good qualities", said, for example, M. Nordau, an ideologist of Zionism, "which do not pertain to any other nation to the same extent."¹ In his writings the founder of so-called "spiritual Zionism"² Ahad Ha'Am referred to the Jews as a "supernation", a "treasure people", the "aristocracy of history", a "kingdom of priests and a people of saints" which among other peoples "represents a genuinely supreme type of humankind". He also wrote of the Jews' "ethical genius".³ Returning time and again to the myth of "Jewish exclusiveness",

* WZO-JA has branches in over 40 countries and WJC in over 60. The WZO membership includes about 20 international Zionist organisations ranging from ultra-right and pro-fascist to "left-wing socialist" ones.

the late honorary WJC President N. Goldman, a prominent figure in international Zionism, claimed, “The Jewish people is a unique historical being. It is a people, a religion, a race and the bearer of a particular civilization and no term from among the non-Jewish terms, such as ‘people’, ‘nation’ or ‘religion’, can properly define that particular phenomenon which is named the Jewish people in history. . . . Three basic elements characterize it: its being an international people, its being connected with Palestine and its being, in the general historical respect, one of the groups which are not identifiable in world history.”⁴

The concept of “Jewish state on the land of forefathers” holds a special place in Zionist ideology. Flying in the face of irrefutable facts, Zionist propaganda tries to portray the imperialist, racist and clerical state of Israel as an “egalitarian”, “especially democratic” and almost “socialist” one.⁵ For example, a propaganda booklet put out in Tel Aviv in 1958 claims: the small state of Israel is of absolutely exceptional interest, because it combines features of a traditional and a revolutionary state. In this sense it is unique, unmatched by any other state in the world. On the one hand it tries to pick up the broken threads and to revive old, seemingly irretrievably lost, values. On the other, it is a state of a New Start, pursuing on a revolutionary scale an unprecedented challenge or a social Utopia of a special kind.⁶

Since Zionism’s inception its ideologists and leaders have been hammering home their own versions of the racist theories of the West’s “civilizing mission” in the East and the “white man’s burden”. T. Herzl, for one, repeatedly wrote that in Palestine Zionists should build an “outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism”, form a “portion of the rampart of Europe against Asia” and “an outpost of Western culture” on this shortest road to Asia.⁷ In short, proclaiming itself a “national-liberation movement” and a “Jewish revolution”, from the very outset Zionism revealed its bourgeois-nationalist, pro-imperialist and colonialist essence. Addressing the 2nd Zionist Congress in 1898, T. Herzl was specific enough on this point: “. . . the English were the first to recognize the necessity of colonial expansion in the modern world. . . . And therefore I believe the Zionist idea, which is a colonial idea, must be understood in England easily and quickly.”⁸ M. Nordau, T. Herzl’s closest associate, stressed in his speech at the 7th Zionist Congress in 1905 that Zionism could assume the

task of the struggle against the Arabs' national-liberation movement.⁹

It must be noted that such offers made by Zionist leaders fully corresponded with the British ruling quarters' imperial interests. For example, a 9 December 1918 memorandum of the British General Staff stressed: "The creation of a buffer Jewish state in Palestine, though this State will be weak in itself, is strategically desirable for Great Britain."¹⁰ After the British Cabinet's Balfour Declaration¹¹ (2 November 1917) and the League of Nation's mandate to Britain to govern Palestine (24 July 1922) the Zionist colonization of the country entered a new stage. Proclaiming the Jews' "historical" and even "divine" right to Palestine and posing as "fighters against anti-Semitism" and "saviours of the Jewish people", Zionists proceeded to lay a chauvinist-racist foundation of their state in "the Holy Land".

On the eve of and during World War II Zionists gradually reoriented themselves towards the USA as the leading power in the capitalist world, while preserving their links with Britain's ruling quarters. In the late 30s-early 40s the centre of international Zionism moved from Europe to the USA. This contributed to the forging and strengthening of an alliance between American imperialism, which had set its sights on world hegemony, and Zionism, which relied on Washington's assistance in the attainment of its hegemonic goals in the Middle East. In a 5 May 1943 letter to President Roosevelt his personal representative General Patrick J. Hurley reported from Cairo that the programme of the Zionist organization in Palestine called for "Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control."¹²

Regarding Zionism as one of the main tools of attaining their hegemonic objectives in the world, including the Middle East, the US ruling quarters invariably accorded considerable support to the Zionist leaders. Steering a course towards world hegemony and imposing a Pax Americana on all peoples, US imperialism has viewed Israel as its main outpost in the Middle East, although it has also sought to use pro-Western Arab regimes in its interests. For their part, seeking to build a "Pax Israelica" in the Middle East, Israel's ruling quarters and the international Zionist leaders readily agreed to make "the Jewish state" an imperialist outpost in the region. As far back as in 1948, Secretary of Defense

L. Johnson claimed that “Israel is important strategically”, and as a consequence the USA “must support her”.¹³ For his part Israel’s Foreign Minister M. Sharett said in 1952, “... The active participation of the Jews [meaning Zionists] of the USA in the building of our state is conditioned on the integration of Israel’s foreign policy into the global policy of Washington.”¹⁴

Twenty years later, in 1973, Israel’s Prime Minister G. Meir was more explicit about Israel’s strategic importance for the USA: “Israel is really a safeguard for the maintenance of American interests in the area, and the first line of defense [i.e. penetration and consolidation—*L.D.*] for American interests in the Mediterranean basin.” G. Meir went on to stress that Israel lays claim to a special role in the Middle East, asserting that the country is “the main safeguard for the protection of the Islamic regimes that are loyal to them [the USA] in the area.”¹⁵

Let us have a look at history and follow step by step how the alliance of Tel Aviv and Washington was formed and strengthened. It is a matter of record that back in 1949 Ben-Gurion, the first Israeli head of state, put forward the idea of forming a formal alliance between the state of Israel and imperialism’s forces.¹⁶ During his May 1951 visit to the USA Ben-Gurion thus defined the policies of Israel’s ruling quarters: “Israel has always been and will remain on the side of the Western powers.”¹⁷ 1952 saw the signing of an agreement on the granting of a US loan to Israel and a military agreement which remained secret until 1961. Starting with 1951 Israel repeatedly offered the USA and Great Britain to sign a military pact. In 1955 she expressed preparedness to permit US bases on her territory and in subsequent years pushed for a Mediterranean military alliance under the US aegis.

However, at the time the US ruling quarters saw no need for a formal military pact, because Israel was clearly increasingly in the wake of the US foreign policy: Israel’s government supported the creation of the Baghdad Pact (February 1955) and the Eisenhower doctrine (January 1957); which were spearheaded against the national-liberation movement in the Middle East.

When the national-patriotic anti-imperialist forces in Syria strengthened their positions in 1957, Israel’s leaders claimed that the country had turned into a “base for international Communism”. Calling on the White House to act resolutely, Ben-Gurion

wrote to Secretary of State John F. Dulles, "...I believe the free world ought not to accept this situation. Everything depends on the firm and determined line taken by the United States."¹⁸ At the time, Washington was planning to launch a direct intervention against Syria using the armed forces of neighbouring states, primarily Turkey and Israel. The firm support of the Syrian people by the Soviet Union and the progressive international public thwarted the aggressive plan.

In July 1958 Israel gave her unconditional support for the landing of US troops in Lebanon and British troops in Jordan. What is more, the Israeli government was prepared to help imperialism crush the popular uprising in Lebanon. British troops in Jordan were moved and supplied through Israeli territory.

Since the proclamation of the state of Israel, Middle East has been the scene of five wars. As a result of the 1948-1949 Arab-Israeli war Israel annexed 6,600 square kilometers of the territory destined to the Palestinian Arab state under a UN resolution. In October 1956 Israeli troops occupied the Sinai Peninsula, while Britain and France landed troops in the Suez Canal area. The main aim of the Tripartite Aggression against Egypt was the overthrow of the progressive Nasser regime. Owing to the decisive support rendered to Egypt by the Soviet Union, other countries of the socialist community, the peoples of the Arab East and other anti-imperialist forces, the Suez adventure ended in a complete fiasco. In the spring of 1957 Israel had to withdraw her troops from the Sinai Peninsula. In view of the aggressor's international isolation and making tactical advances to the Arabs, the United States thought it wise at the time to abstain from open manifestation of support for its allies.

During the June 1967 Israeli aggression against Arab countries, which had been prepared with the most active participation of government agencies and intelligence services of the USA and several other NATO countries, another attempt was made to overthrow the progressive regime of Nasser and to simultaneously unseat the anti-imperialist government of Syria. The 1967 war showed that the USA had definitively put its stake on Israel, regarding her as its main ally in the Middle East. By that time, under the cover of the demagogical slogan of "promoting" decolonization, US imperialism had consolidated its positions in the Middle East at the expense of the traditional colonial powers,

England and France, and emerged as "enemy No. 1" of the Arab liberation movement.

As a result of the 1967 aggression Israel occupied large chunks of Egypt (the Sinai Peninsula), and Syria (the Golan Heights), as well as the West Bank of the Jordan River, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip. The total area of the Arab territories occupied by Israel was 60,000 sq. km., or four times the area given to Israel by the UN resolution on the partition of Palestine.

It must be emphasized in this connection that Israel's Declaration of Independence of 14 May 1948 referred to the whole of Palestine, two thirds of whose population were Arabs, as the "land of Israel", while the borders of the state of Israel were not delineated.¹⁹ This was not a political oversight. In 1951 Israel's Prime Minister Ben-Gurion stressed, "We have set up a dynamic State, bent upon expansion. Our state was created in a part of our small country."²⁰ In 1969 Ben-Gurion claimed that Israel had settled only 20 per cent of its land.²¹

Intoxicated by its successes in the Six Day War, official Tel Aviv and international Zionist leaders decided that their plans to impose Israeli hegemony on the Middle East were close to fruition. Relying upon all-round support of imperialist powers, primarily the USA, as well as on financial and economic assistance of Jewish big bourgeoisie, Israel's rulers thought that there was nothing left for the Arabs but accept "peace" on Israeli terms. What Israel was after was to build her relations with the countries in the region on the old pattern of US hegemony. Israeli Foreign Minister A. Eban wrote back in the 50s that Israel aspires for relationships with her Arab neighbours "akin to the relationship between the United States and the Latin American continent."²²

Pursuing this objective, Israel's ruling quarters, with US backing, transformed the country into a vast arsenal. Beginning with 1948 Israel accounted for one tenth, and after 1967 about 25 per cent of all US foreign aid. Through official channels alone in 1948 through to 1982 Tel Aviv received \$25.3 billion from Washington: \$10 billion as military loans, \$6.8 billion and \$5.7 billion respectively as free military and economic aid, and remaining \$2.8 billion as credits for economic development. According to certain sources, if one takes into account donations and loans of all sorts of Zionist and pro-Zionist organizations, the total US

financial assistance to Israel topped the \$60 billion mark in 1983. In the 1984 fiscal year* Washington allocated \$2.7 billion in assistance to Israel, \$225 million more than in the preceding year. \$1.7 billion of the total has been appropriated as military aid to Israel.

For the 1985 fiscal year the US administration intends to seek congressional approval of \$1.4 billion worth of completely free military aid to Tel Aviv. The *Washington Post* reported on 21 December 1983 that President Reagan had promised Israel's leaders another increase in military aid in fiscal 1986.

As a rule, states receiving military aid from the USA are obliged to buy American weapons, which, firstly, boosts the arms manufacturers' orders, and, secondly, makes the countries increasingly dependent on Washington. However, the USA made a generous concession to its "strategic ally": \$550 million of the total financial assistance received by Israel in fiscal year 1984 is to be spent on the production of Israel-designed sophisticated jet fighter-bomber.

The practice of writing off Israel's military and other debts is becoming increasingly common. For example, in 1974-1983 the USA relieved Israel of the need to pay \$5.5 billion in debt. In 1984 Israel received a \$750 million subsidy from the United States.

The USA, which accounts for two thirds of Israel's arms imports, supplies its client state and ally with the most up-to-date weapons which are sometimes not available even to NATO members. In fiscal 1983 Israel bought \$2.5 billion worth of US war materiel. She also spends enormous sums of money on the domestic production of modern weaponry. As a result, direct military spending alone constitutes 30-31 per cent of the country's gross national product. The inclusion of debt servicing and other indirect spending "for security purposes" boosts the military bill to almost two thirds of the national budget.

Militarism permeates all spheres of life in Israel. 24 per cent of the country's able-bodied population (between the ages of 18 and 45) serve in the army. Eleven per cent are on the rolls of the police and intelligence agencies, and 15 per cent are employed in the military industry. According to *Le Monde Diplomatique*, in Israel "the army's influence is decisive in the life of in-

* In Israel the fiscal year starts on 1 April.

dividuals and in the national economy".²³ The armed forces' disproportionate size and influence in Israel's state structure stems from her continuing aggressive foreign policy with its annexationist main thrust.

Lebanon has long been a target of Israeli expansionism. Already the 1st WZO Congress (1897) laid claim to a part of Lebanon's territory and the Litani River was proclaimed to be the natural northern border of the Jewish state. Since the proclamation of the state of Israel Lebanon has been the butt of non-stop armed provocations by Zionists. The situation is especially difficult in the south of Lebanon, where "retaliatory" incursions of the Israeli army, shellings and air attacks have been an everyday occurrence. In March 1978, under the pretext of "combating terrorism", the Israeli army occupied South Lebanon—a move tantamount to launching a new war in the region. In April 1980 Israel staged another large-scale invasion of South Lebanon, and toward the end of the year made a step which amounted to a de facto change in the delineation of the Lebanese-Israeli border: the Israeli military moved the barbed-wire fence marking the boundary between Lebanon and Israel 700 metres into Lebanese territory. In addition, in several sectors of the border 100-metre-wide mine fields were laid. Israel set up a network of military outposts and encampments in South Lebanon, where Lebanese separatists received military training. In the border zone special offices were set up to buy land and other immovables from the Lebanese. Israeli currency freely circulates in the area. The moves are part of the "creeping annexation" tactic, and are also used on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip.

In June 1982, Israel's ruling quarters, encouraged and egged on by US imperialism, unleashed a new bloody war against the Palestinian Arab and Lebanese peoples. Zionists and their imperialist backers had the following main objectives: to liquidate the Palestinian national-liberation movement by physically destroying the PLO's leadership and military structure in Lebanon; to smash the Lebanese national-liberation forces and to turn the "cedar country" into a US-Israeli protectorate; and, finally, to impose a "peace treaty" on Lebanon and make it an accomplice in the Camp David process.

"The war", wrote *The Observer* on 26 September 1982, "was an attempt to solve the Palestine problem by armed force and

to establish Israel's pre-eminence in the Levant as far ahead as man could see". Analyzing the situation, *Al-Ahali*, mouthpiece of Egypt's National Progressive Unionist Party (a left-wing party), wrote in its 28 October 1982 issue that Israel seeks a de facto partition of Lebanon. The newspaper went on to say that after the partition Israel, with US support, would try to "bring the neighbouring Arab states, primarily Syria and Jordan, out of the state of confrontation with her" and "would press for full hegemony in the region".

On 17 May 1983 a Lebanese-Israeli peace agreement was signed in the Lebanese town of Halde and the Israeli town of Qiryat Shemona. The document, praised to the skies by the imperialist and Zionist press and guaranteed by Washington, contained a number of provisions which amounted to a serious encroachment on Lebanon's sovereignty and independence. The Arab quarters regarded the Lebanese-Israeli agreement as a direct threat to the security of Syria and other states in the region. Thus, under the agreement, Lebanon is not allowed to have in its territory anti-aircraft weapons with a range in excess of 15,000 feet, which gives Israel complete control of the Lebanese airspace. Lebanese aircraft are prohibited from overflying the south of the country without preliminary notification of the Israeli authorities. What is more, this agreement imposed on the government of Lebanon empowers Israeli troops to stay indefinitely in the south of Lebanon in the 50 km-wide so-called "security zone".

Talking President Amin Gemayel of Lebanon into signing the peace agreement with Israel, high-ranking officials of the Reagan Administration assured him that within a period of three months they would secure the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. This time, too, however, Washington's words proved to be at variance with its deeds: the USA was in no hurry to keep its "promise". Supporting Tel Aviv's demand that the Israeli withdrawal is contingent on the withdrawal of Syrian forces from Lebanon, the US ruling quarters were guided not by the Lebanon-Israel agreement but by another document which for a long time was kept secret from the world public.

Much later it was disclosed that simultaneously with the Lebanon-Israel peace agreement the USA and Israel signed a secret memorandum under which Tel Aviv reserved the right to make

punitive incursions into Lebanon in the case of “threat” to her security or a “terrorist” attack (the name is used by the Zionist and imperialist press to describe Palestinian fedayeen and Lebanese patriots—*L.D.*). It was in this memorandum, not in the published Lebanon-Israel agreement, that the withdrawal of Israeli troops was made contingent on the evacuation of the Syrian contingent of the Inter-Arab Peacekeeping Forces and the Palestinian formations remaining in Lebanon. In addition, the memorandum contained provision for the further increase of the US military aid to Israel.

Soon after the signing of the Lebanon-Israel agreement Washington pressured a session of the European Communities Council at the level of heads of state and government of the Common Market countries into lifting a temporary embargo on financial assistance to Israel and resuming exchanges of government delegations between EEC members and Israel on a permanent basis.

With the blessing of the USA and other Western countries Israel pursues a “position-of-strength policy” towards other Middle East countries. For example, in June 1981 the Israeli air force staged an unprovoked attack on the Atomic Research Center in Baghdad, which operated strictly in compliance with the rules of the International Atomic Energy Agency. This act of wanton aggression against Iraq was sanctioned by Washington, to say nothing of the fact that Tel Aviv used latest US-made aircraft, electronic equipment and bombs in the raid.

* * *

World imperialism’s global plans give Israel the role of a “regional metropolis” or a “regional superpower” in the Middle East. As part of these plans during the last few years the USA and several other Western countries have been seriously considering the Israeli idea of “open borders” between Israel and a number of Arab states and the prospective creation of a Common Market-type organization in the Middle East, in which Israel is to play a leading role.

After the Camp David deal and the signing of the so-called peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, the Arab public began to fear that Israel would now try to penetrate the economies of a number of countries in the Arab East with a view to establish-

ing its control over certain sectors. Sadat's capitulationist policies gave Tel Aviv hopes that Egyptian trading houses would act as go-betweens in the marketing of Israel-made products in Arab countries. Israel hoped to gain a foothold in the Egyptian economy, primarily in its oil production industry, with the financial backing of the USA and other Western countries.

Owing to a number of circumstances, Israeli penetration of the Egyptian economy has not acquired large proportions. This does not mean, however, that Israel has abandoned her plans to escalate its economic offensive on Egypt. There are plans under which Israeli exports to Egypt in 1985 are to reach \$2 billion, while imports from Egypt are not to exceed \$80 million.²⁴

After the 1982 aggression Israel has staged a broad penetration of Lebanon's economy, trampling on the unwritten laws of the business world. For example, after seizing the premises of Lebanese banks in Saida and Tyre, the Israeli invaders purposely made public the secret information pertaining to deposits. In June 1982 the major Israeli banks Hapoalim (which, incidentally, is nominally owned by Histadrut), Leumi and Mizrahi opened so-called mobile branches in Lebanon. In its 22 June 1982 issue the *Jerusalem Post* noted that the mobile banks, which operate in close contact with the military command, plan to extent their operations not only to Israeli servicemen but primarily to the local Lebanese population. The Israeli military authorities in Lebanon usually act as agents of Israeli manufacturers and trading companies, taking orders for goods deliveries from Israel and creating favourable conditions for their marketing in Lebanon.*

The Chairman of Lebanon's Parliament Kamal al-Assad stressed in January 1984 that in occupied South Lebanon Israel conducts a consistent policy of undermining the area's agriculture and economy as a whole. The Lebanese weekly *Al Kifah al Arabi* commented in October 1982 that Israel's "economic aggression" against Lebanon is carried out in accordance with an elaborated plan. Under the plan Tel Aviv seeks to destabilize and run down Lebanon's economy, to deprive the country of

* Israeli commodities are imported to Lebanon duty-free, which makes them cheaper than locally made goods. This largely undercuts the Lebanese firms' competitiveness vis-à-vis Israeli ones.

manpower by compelling hundreds of thousands of industrial and agricultural workers to look for employment abroad, and in this way to make Lebanon completely dependent on Israeli imports.

Between June 1982 and June 1983 Israel exported \$150 million worth of goods to Lebanon. What is even more important for Israel's big business is that since 1982 a certain part of Lebanon's foreign trade has been going via the Israeli port of Haifa. Since two thirds of Lebanon's exports are destined to the Arab world (primarily to Saudi Arabia), Israel's ruling quarters view Lebanon as an invaluable base for the penetration of the Arab markets. Tel Aviv hopes that using all sort of machinations (falsified voices and trademarks, front companies, etc.) it will go around the Arab boycott of Israeli goods.

After Camp David, Washington hoped that it would be able to set up an aggressive bloc in the Middle East, spearheaded against the Arab national-liberation movement, as well as against the USSR and other socialist countries. The ruling quarters of the USA and international Zionism had plans of setting up a Middle East Treaty Organization (METO), which would effectively seal Israel's preeminence in the region.²⁵

The US Republican administration has tried hard to convince the conservative Arab regimes that the root cause of the long-drawn-out crises in the Middle East is not the unceasing Israeli aggression against the Arabs, but "Soviet expansionism". Throwing the "Soviet military threat" scare at the "moderate" regimes in the Middle and Near East, during his April 1981 tour of the region the then Secretary of State Haig tried to knock together an informal "strategic consensus" ranging from Pakistan in the east to Egypt in the west, and including Saudi Arabia, Israel and Turkey.²⁶

Along with the Israeli government, the influential Zionist and pro-Israeli lobby in the USA have long been doing everything to give Israel the status of America's most trusted ally in the Middle East. Since the early 80s the USA has pursued a policy of direct military presence in the region and the creation of military bases there. After the Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai, the USA used the flag of the "multinational force" to station there a battalion of its 82nd air borne division, which is the striking element of the interventionist Rapid Deployment Force.

The summer 1982 landing of US marines in Lebanon under the flag of the "multinational force" broadened the geography of direct US military presence in the Middle East.

The September 1981 talks between President Reagan and the then Israeli Prime Minister Begin culminated in the proclamation of strategic co-operation between the world's two most aggressive states—the USA and Israel. On 30 November of the same year the defence ministers of the two countries Weinberger and Sharon, the future executioner of Sabra and Shatila, signed a "memorandum on mutual understanding in the sphere of strategic cooperation".

Washington's and Tel Aviv's congruent strategic policies and the former's stake on the latter as its main outpost in the Middle East were once again reaffirmed in the secret directive signed by President Reagan on 29 October 1983. The main thrust of the document is toward the strengthening and broadening of co-operation with Israel, primarily in the military sphere.

During the November 1983 Washington visit of Israeli Prime Minister Shamir and Defense Minister Arens the "strategic co-operation" between the two countries was elevated to the rank of an almost formal military-political alliance. After the talks between Reagan and Shamir it was decided to set up a Joint US-Israeli Military Political Committee, whose first sitting took place in January 1984. The committee's functions include military planning coordination, conduct of joint military exercises and the stockpiling of US weapons on Israeli territory. Other functions of the committee include the provision of Israeli ports, notably Haifa, with facilities for servicing the warships of the US Sixth Fleet, as well as the equipment of Israeli hospitals for receiving US servicemen. During the Washington talks the US administration made a decision to increase financial assistance to Israel and to grant her unprecedented privileges in this field. There were press reports that at the time of the Shamir-Arens visit another secret agreement was concluded which provided for mounting pressure on Syria to force her withdraw her troops from Lebanon.

During the November 1983 Reagan-Shamir meeting it was also decided to establish "free trade" relations between the USA and Israel along the lines of the relationship between Israel and the EEC planned to take effect in 1987. It is to be recalled that

under the "free trade" agreement signed between Israel and the European Common Market in 1972, Israel's exports to EEC members are to be duty-free, while tariffs on EEC exports to Israel are to be gradually phased out by 1987. The official negotiations between Washington and Tel Aviv on the creation of a "free trade" zone started in January 1984.

On 22 December 1983, the last day of the 38th Session of the UN General Assembly, the majority of the international community adopted a resolution condemning the "strategic co-operation" between the USA and Israel. The assembly censured practically the entire Middle East policy of the Reagan administration ranging from interference in the Arab states' internal affairs to the encouragement of Israel to launch new bloody adventures in the region. The international forum once again strongly condemned Israel's aggressive expansionist policies and her hegemonic encroachments, which pose a threat to the peoples in the Middle East and the world over.

References

1. M. Nordau. *Max Nordau to his People*. A Summons and a Challenge, Scopus Publishing Co., N.Y., 1941, p. 92.
2. "Spiritual Zionism" does not call for the return of the Jews to their "ancestral land". It regards the "Jewish state" not as a political, but as a religious, spiritual and cultural centre of the "world Jewish nation". Ahad Ha'Am's concepts, complemented by a slightly modified theory of "national-cultural autonomy", which is no less nationalistic in character, are broadly used by Zionists to segregate Jews in their countries of residence, to place Jewish populations at large under religious influences and to draw them into Zionist and pro-Zionist organizations. "Spiritual Zionism" is thus not in conflict with "political Zionism" but complements it.
3. See Ahad Ha'Am. *Nationalism and Jewish Ethics*. N. Y., 1962. The Zionist Idea, ed. by A. Hertzberg, Harper, N. Y., 1959, p. 24.
4. Quoted from: *Information Bulletin. Communist Party of Israel*. Tel Aviv, 1969, No. 3/4, p. 191.

5. See, for example, the article by Sh. Perez "Israeli Socialism as a Form of Democratic-Socialist Workers' Movement" in *Demokratischer Sozialismus in den achtziger Jahren*. Hrsg. Von R. Löwenthal, Europäische Verlagsanstalt, Köln-Frankfurt am Main, 1979, S. 142-166; as well as the article by S. Avineri in *Israel Horizons*, N.Y., March 1971.
6. See A Galin. *Israel—Jewish state*, Tel Aviv, Omanut, 1958, p. 3 (in Russ.).
7. See Th. Herzl. *The Jewish State*. Scopus Publishing Co., N.Y., 1943, p. 30.
8. See *Herzl Year Book*, Vol. III, N.Y., 1960, pp. 42, 43.
9. See H. Lumer. *Zionism. Its Role in World Politics*, International Publishers, New York, 1973, pp. 32, 33.
10. *The Strategic Importance of Syria to the British Empire*, General Staff, War Office. December 1918, F.O. 371/4178, PRO.
11. The Balfour Declaration is an official British Government statement about the creation of a "Jewish national homeland" in Palestine. The declaration was a manoeuvre of British imperialism which wanted to divest itself of its commitment before the Arabs to make Palestine a part of an Arab state. It added to the antagonism between the Jewish and Arab residents of Palestine and sealed the British imperialist domination of Palestine with the help of Zionists.
12. *United States: Foreign Relations of the US: Near East and Africa*. Washington, 1964, Vol. IV, pp. 776-777.
13. Quoted from: James G. McDonald. *My Mission in Israel, 1948-1951*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1951, p. 189.
14. *Al Hamishmar*, 5 August 1952.
15. *Haaretz*, 7 March 1973.
16. N. Weinstock, *Le sionisme contre Israël*, ed. François Masper, Paris, 1969, p. 514.
17. See *L'Humanité*, 12 April 1967.

18. Michael Bar-Zohar. *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice Hall, New York, 1968, pp. 241-242.
19. See *Time*, October 18, 1971, pp. 38-39.
20. *State of Israel, Government Yearbook*, 5712/1951/1952, Jerusalem, Government Printer, Introduction, 1951, p. X.
21. See *The Jewish Observer*, June 13, 1969.
22. A. Eban. *Voice of Israel*, Horizon Press, New York, 1957, p. 76.
23. *Le Monde diplomatique*, juillet 1969, p. 1.
24. According to IMF data, Israel's exports to Egypt were: in 1980—\$2.7 million, in 1981—\$11.8 million, and in 1982—\$21 million (from Israeli sources). Egypt's exports to Israel (its lion's share is constituted by oil) dropped in 1982 by 74 million Egyptian Pounds against 1981 to 310 million.
25. See, for example, *The New York Times*, August 3, 1978; *Demain L'Afrique* (Paris), N 41, 14 January 1980.
26. See *The New York Times*, April 5, 1981.

**THE TRAGEDY OF LEBANON.
THE PLANS AND DEEDS OF
THE ZIONIST AGGRESSORS**

The “Mediterranean Switzerland”, the “showcase of the West”, a “corner of paradise”, an “oasis of stability”—those were the names given to Lebanon in the 50s-60s amidst the turbulent Middle East. At that time, few stopped to think that from the very moment the Jewish bourgeoisie initiated its reactionary chauvinist ideology, Zionists had levelled their sights on the “Lebanese oasis”. Even at their 1st Congress in Basel in 1897, Zionist leaders announced their claims to Palestine and the neighbouring Arab lands, including Lebanon’s southern regions. In 1919, the World Zionist Organisation (WZO) submitted to the Paris Peace Conference the draft of a Jewish state that included the Litani, a river in South Lebanon.¹

After forming the state of Israel, the country’s leaders lost no time in mapping out expansionist plans with regard to Lebanon. On May 21, 1948, i.e., a week after the state of Israel was established, its first prime minister, Ben Gurion, wrote in his diary: “The Achilles heel of the Arab coalition is the Lebanon. Muslim supremacy in this country is artificial and can easily be overthrown. A Christian State ought to be set up here, with its southern frontier on the river Litani. We would sign a treaty of alliance with this state.”² In February 1954, Ben Gurion referred to the setting up in Lebanon of a puppet right-Christian regime as “the *central duty*, or at least one of the central duties, of our foreign policy”, insisting on taking vigorous measures towards its practical fulfilment.³

The future of Lebanon was visualised along the same lines by another superhawk, Moshe Dayan, who suggested that the Israeli leadership come to terms with some Lebanese officer: “...the only thing that’s necessary is to find an officer, even just a major. We should either win his heart or buy him with mon-

ey to make him agree to declare himself the savior of the Maronite population. Then the Israeli army will enter Lebanon, will occupy the necessary territory, and will create a Christian regime which will ally itself with Israel.”⁴

From the very start the two basic directions of Zionist subversive activity against Lebanon were destabilisation of the internal situation in the country by provoking intercommunity clashes and armed provocations along the frontiers.

The aggressive nature of Israel’s policy towards Lebanon was especially apparent when masses of Palestinian Arabs started pouring into the country in an effort to escape Zionist terror in Palestine and seek refuge in neighbouring countries. Following the Arab-Israeli War of 1948-1949, the Israeli aggression of 1967, and the bloody events in Jordan (1970) provoked by imperialist agents, a total of about 260,000 Palestinian Arabs⁵) migrated to Lebanon, most of them settling in refugee camps in the South and around Beirut with the permission of the Lebanese Government. Their number reached 500,000 by the early 80s.

In an attempt to stifle the Palestinian Resistance Movement, starting from the latter half of the 60s Israel increasingly resorted to methods of political and military pressure on Lebanon, which had become the operational centre of the PRM. Here are a few examples: a pirate attack on the Beirut international airport by the Israeli military, 1968; periodic bombardments of Lebanon’s southern regions aimed at turning them into a “dead zone”, 1969; a series of incursions of Israeli troops into Lebanese territory and temporary occupation of border areas, 1970-1972; acts of terrorism against several prominent Palestinian figures residing in Beirut, 1973.

Trying to split Lebanon into a number of mini-states, the Zionists did everything possible to destabilise the internal situation in that country. Two major religious groups have existed in Lebanon long since: Christian and Muslim. And these two groups are divided into several denominations and sects. The confessional system (distribution of political power among religious communities according to established proportions), adopted by the National Pact in 1943, under the French Mandate, promoted the supremacy of the right-wing Maronite forces (Christians outnumbered Muslims according to the 1932 census), which led

to the inferior position of the Muslim population and actually fostered intercommunal rivalry.

That was what Ben Gurion had in mind when calling Lebanon "the Achilles heel of the Arab coalition". Confessional rivalry, further aggravated by deepening social and class contradictions, created a favourable environment in the country for imperialist and Zionist agents to exacerbate domestic conflicts. Pouring oil on the flame, the Israeli and Western propaganda machines were busy spreading speculations about the alleged "irreconcilable enmity" between the Christian and Muslim communities. Internecine dissension became one of Tel Aviv's most effective instruments in attaining its expansionist objectives. This was especially obvious during the fratricidal civil war of 1975-1976, which broke out with the help of the Zionists.

In a broader sense, the internal tensions in Lebanon have always been closely linked to the poor settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. "The civil war in Lebanon has become an inevitable consequence of Kissinger's 'small step' policy", *Le Monde diplomatique* wrote.⁶ Each time another capitulatory deal was concluded behind the back of the Arab peoples, there was a sharp deterioration of the internal situation in Lebanon, aptly referred to as the "barometer" of the Middle East conflict. This was due to the growing polarisation of political forces holding differing, if not diametrically opposed, positions on the issue of settling the Middle East crisis. Inciting internal discord in Lebanon, imperialism and Zionism tried to spark off a new hotbed of tension in the Arab world, weaken the united Arab front fighting against Israeli aggression, eliminate the PRM, neutralise Syria and draw Lebanon into a system of separate settlements planned by Washington and Tel Aviv in order to secure their dictate in the Middle East region.

Israel's armed provocations, which were growing in scope year after year, were augmented by the subversive propaganda of the Zionist mass media which wished to lay the blame for the aggravation of the Lebanese crisis at the Palestinians' door. The Israeli newspaper *Ma'ariv* wrote that the primary objective of the PRM was to "do away with the rights of the Christians in Lebanon and impose the rule of the Muslim Arabs on them".⁷

Israel offered the right-wing Christian forces considerable aid during the civil war, delivering 110 tanks and armoured carriers,

5 thousand machine guns, and 12 thousand small arm weapons. By keeping the fratricidal conflict burning, the Zionists were counting on ending the Palestinian presence in Lebanon through the Lebanese reactionary forces.

Analysing Zionist plans for the division of Lebanon, American analysts P. Jureidini and R.D. McLaurin wrote in their book *Beyond Camp David*: "The prevailing expectation appears to be that Lebanon will devolve towards a loose, confederal system, probably with almost complete autonomy for Christian areas (part of Beirut and Mount Lebanon), the Shiite areas of Bekaa and southern Lebanon, the Druze in the Shuf, and Sunni enclaves in Beirut, Sidon and Tripoli... If Lebanon within its traditional boundaries remains on the map of the Middle East under these conditions, it may mean the eviction of all Palestinians from the south of the country."⁸

The course of events in the post-civil war period provides evidence that imperialist and Zionist circles considered Lebanon as a sort of a test laboratory for evolving methods of setting up their dictate through dividing the country along religious and communal lines. The Paris based magazine *Afrique-Asie* reported in October 1982: "To divide Lebanon into five provinces, to dissect Egypt and deprive it of its central power, to dissect Syria and Iraq into smaller states along religious or ethnic lines, to effect the dissolution of the Arabian Peninsula, in a word, to split the entire Arab world—such is the plan of the Israeli leaders."

The scope of Israeli provocations against Lebanon increased dramatically after the Sadat regime ultimately submitted to a course of capitulation. Realising that its Egyptian rear was secure after Sadat's "pilgrimage" to Jerusalem (November 1977), Tel Aviv undertook a new armed adventure against Lebanon as early as March 1978 that ended in the intruders' occupation of South Lebanon all the way to the river Litani.

Faced with strong censure from the international community, Tel Aviv withdrew its forces from South Lebanon in June that same year; however, the interventionists returned only 5 of the 14 combat positions to the authority of the UN International Forces which had been set up on the decision of the Security Council. A vast enclave measuring approximately 15×80 km immediately adjacent to the Israeli-Lebanese border was handed over by the occupants to the separatists of major Haddad.⁹ In

April 1979, Saad Haddad proclaimed "The State of Free Lebanon" in the territory controlled by him. This area became the Israeli bridgehead in the south of the country. Thus the anti-Lebanese ventures conceived by Moshe Dayan nearly a quarter of a century ago had begun to materialise.

Seeking a pretext to begin a large-scale military incursion deep into Lebanon, in April 1981 the Zionists provoked an armed conflict between the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab security forces and the Phalangists in Zahle, a city of 200,000 (90 per cent Christians) situated in the Bekaa valley, about 40 km east of Beirut. The Zionists' chief aim was to establish control over the Bekaa and cut off the major routes between Damascus and Beirut, thereby bisecting the country and threatening both Arab capitals. As before, Tel Aviv was counting on inciting Christian-Muslim rivalry. The Israeli media was spreading inflammatory reports in those days that the Christian segment of the population in Zahle was on the verge of being exterminated by the "Muslim Barbarians".¹⁰ Analysing the April crisis of 1981, the journal *Le Monde diplomatique* reported: "From now on Israel has an excellent moral pretext for interfering in the Lebanese conflict: saving Lebanese Christians."¹¹

In July 1981 Israel undertook its greatest armed venture against Lebanon since the 1978 aggression. The barbarous attack of Israeli aircraft on Beirut's living quarters and the Palestine refugee camps resulted in the killing of hundreds of innocent people. A TASS statement announced: "Israel could never behave with such brazen arrogance without sensing support, and worse still, encouragement on the part of the United States of America. It is from there that the deadly cargo is pouring in, to be dropped by Israel on the Lebanese and Palestinian people who found temporary refuge in Lebanon."¹²

The Arab political community viewed the further aggravation of the situation in Lebanon in the spring and summer of 1981 as directly connected with the Camp David deal and the desire of imperialism, Zionism and local reactionary forces to disperse the PRM detachments in Lebanon, intimidate the country's government, impose a separatist deal with Israel, and make the prospect of a comprehensive, just settlement in the Middle East even more remote.

Encouraged by Washington, Israel started preparations for a

large-scale act of aggression against Lebanon in the summer of 1981. On June 6, 1982, Israel launched an offensive to "clean" Lebanon of the Palestinian Arabs, destroy the Lebanese national patriotic forces, impose a pro-Zionist regime in the country and pressure Syria into recalling its military contingent from Lebanon. Those were the basic aims of an operation which was supposed to be a blitzkrieg, but turned into the most gory and prolonged war in the region.

Tel Aviv's attempts to sell this adventure as an "act of retaliation" for an attempt to kill the Israeli ambassador in London (June 3) were futile. According to *Jerusalem Post*, Sharon admitted that he had been "planning this operation since [he] took office" (in July 1981). Said Sharon, "After the war of 1973, there appeared a new generation of Israeli soldiers possessing no combat experience, but needing it."¹³ Here, again, is what his closest associate, Chief of Staff Rafael Eitan said in an interview to the Israeli newspaper *Yedioth Aharonoth* on June 14, 1982: "Once I have built a war machine that is worth billions of dollars, I must use it." The operation bearing the code name "Peace for Galilee" was thoroughly prepared in advance: troop relocation routes were determined, targets for the artillery and air force were selected and measures to ensure the surprise factor were taken.

A few months before the invasion, the Zionist special services began instigating new intercommunal conflicts in Lebanon with greater vigor. Zionist agents endeavoured to create a situation of chaos and anarchy in the country by assassinating and kidnapping people, setting off explosions in the streets, movie theatres and by other acts of terrorism. The Zionists were trying to fan the flames of civil war again, to split the ranks of the National Patriotic Forces, weaken them and clear the way for realising their aggressive plans. Simultaneously, Syria became a target of subversive activity. To blow up the country's progressive system from the inside, imperialism and Zionism promoted and directed the criminal acts of Muslim Brethren—an ultrareactionary organisation. By inciting intercommunal tensions wherever Syrian forces participated under the banner of the Arab League in Lebanon, the Zionists were trying to create an atmosphere of hostility around them. According to Tel Aviv's plans, the elimination of the NPF and liquidation and removal of the PRM and

the Syrian troops were supposed to create favourable conditions for transferring power in Lebanon to a pro-Israeli administration.

Tel Aviv brazenly challenged world public opinion by launching a large-scale invasion of Lebanon at dawn, on June 6, 1982. The armored units of the invaders marched right past the areas where the "Blue Helmets"—UN intermediary forces—were stationed. Although the expansionist plans of the invaders were an open secret, few expected that the Israeli military would dare a criminal act such as this, the first such violation ever committed against this international organisation in its entire history. Several UN soldiers and officers were the first victims of that aggression.

This new act of intervention by Israel was entirely in keeping with the interests of the imperial policy pursued by Washington, which, having adopted a course of confrontation with the USSR and the world socialist community, was trying to aggravate the Middle East conflict into global dimensions. "This action of ours helped us resolve our own problem, and, moreover, it was of invaluable service to the interests of the United States," stated Simha Erlich, Deputy Premier of Israel.¹⁴

Israel's aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian people is quite rightfully called Israeli-American. The military and economic dependence of Israel on the USA is so great that there is every reason to consider Washington a direct accomplice in the Lebanese venture of 1982. *Time* magazine cited some impressive facts on the role of Washington in beefing up Tel Aviv's "military muscles": "Since Israel became a country in 1948 the US has given \$14.9 billion on military aid. About a third has been in the form of outright grants, the rest in loans that must be repaid within 30 years."¹⁵

Equipped almost entirely with American military hardware, the Israeli war machine actually assumed the responsibility of "doing the dirty work" of promoting the interests of the USA in the Middle East, the kind of work the Americans had to do for themselves in Indo-China. The Lebanese crisis has provided clear evidence of the aggressive nature of the alliance between Washington and Tel Aviv.

International Zionism is a full-time partner together with the USA in Israel's bloody aggression. While the Israeli military

continued its criminal activity in Lebanon and the world's progressive community was denouncing Begin and his clique, Zionist organisations in Western countries continued to lend Tel Aviv financial and moral support. Zionist-minded American millionaires publicly promised Tel Aviv to reimburse its every expenditure connected with its aggression in Lebanon. Using their influence in Western mass media agencies, the Zionists coerced these organisations into "overlooking" the bloody atrocities of the Tel Aviv military and even into justifying them.

Tel Aviv's desire to solve several economic problems through a de facto "recolonisation" of Lebanon was one reason behind Israel's aggression. Imperialist and Zionist plans for Israel call for that country to play the role of "regional parent state" in the Middle East, with the Arab states serving as raw material suppliers and sources of cheap labour.

Beirut has been the business and financial centre in this region for many years. Dozens of banks and international insurance companies are located here. Israeli strategists made up their mind to carry off the palm from Lebanon in this field. When the time comes, the Israelis intend to turn their port of Haifa into a new regional trade centre, into a Middle East "sea gate". Moreover, Israeli aggression made it possible for Tel Aviv to realise its long-cherished strategic objective—to establish complete control over the Litani waterbed in order to divert the river into Israel.

The plans envisage the building of a canal network along the east and south banks of the river, eviction of the local population, and the subsequent transformation of the Litani basin into a gigantic fertile area that would supply the whole of Europe with fruits and vegetables and would bring millions in profits to Israeli monopolies.¹⁶ The prelude to this plan is the "scorched earth" policy Israel has been pursuing in Lebanon in recent years. As a result, a large section of the population has been forced to abandon the southern regions of the country.

Having seized nearly half of the Lebanese territory following the intervention, the Tel Aviv military began preparations for a prolonged occupation. An Israeli military administration appeared in the South Lebanon. The occupants appointed military governors in the captured cities and circulated Israeli shekels. Signs in Hebrew appeared along the roads in South

Lebanon. Sources indicate that the ultranationalist organisation Gush Emunim intends to build Israeli settlements there.

The world press again carried the word "genocide" in the days of the 1982 Israeli aggression. Barbaric bombardments of populated areas, mass killings of civilians, torture and execution by firing squads, use of banned types of weapons—all this has revived the memory of atrocious Nazi experiments and serve as convincing proof of the moral degradation of the Israeli army. Service in the Israeli armed forces is a special type of "schooling" that instills in the soldiers and officers all the characteristics required to make them killers of old people, women and children. The combat training system is permeated with the spirit of blatant racism and religious bigotry. Its goal is to turn out programmed "Dayan- and Sharon-types". Yet the army does more than teach the Zionist doctrine, which is the chief source of racist, mostly anti-Arab morality. The army's practical relations with the Arab population, including the function of ensuring government control over the occupied territories, are bound to form chauvinistic ideas and perceptions in the minds of Israeli servicemen. Ideological brainwashing in the Israeli armed forces is characterised, for example, by moral reference points drilled into the minds of the personnel, which free them from any qualms of consciousness. The soldier, thus, turns into a ravisher, maradeur, plunderer. During its intrusion into Lebanon, the Israeli army grossly violated practically every commonly accepted norm of warfare. Suffice it to say that casualties among the civilian population accounted for 90 per cent of all those killed in the barbaric Tel Aviv military operations. The death toll among children was especially high, infanticide, apparently, was predetermined. The aggressors littered the streets with bombs camouflaged as toys that burst in children's hands piercing them with dozens of metal needles.

Various types of weapons designed for mass slaughter and banned by international conventions, such as ball and cluster bombs, napalm, phosphorus shells, toxic chemical agents, and others, were widely used in Lebanon by the interventionists. Based on information obtained from a surgeon at the Sabra refugee camp, the *Guardian* reported on July 18, 1983: "The rate of mortality among victims brought in for operation was very high. He said that during the 1978 invasion it had been 15% to 20%,

but that this time it was between 30% and 50%. He attributed the higher rate to kind of weapons being used by the Israelis."

Clinics and hospitals, infirmaries and ambulances were all targets in Israeli air attacks. Trying to paralyse the whole system of health care and medical aid, the interventionists blocked off deliveries of blood plasma and medicines into besieged Beirut, and, after seizing the city, they began to remove medical equipment from hospitals.

Having destroyed practically all Palestinian refugee camps on occupied Lebanese territory, the Zionists confined the Palestinian male population in concentration camps where the men were subjected to humiliation and torture. The fate of the fighters of the Palestinian Resistance Movement, who were denied the status of prisoners of war by the Tel Aviv administration, was especially hard.

The Israeli *Ha'aretz* newspaper published a story about one of the paper's employees who was a guard in the Ansar concentration camp. "The situation here was unbearable for both the detainees and ourselves," the employee wrote, noting that many prisoners disappeared without a trace. "Nervous breakdowns were not an infrequent occurrence among our soldiers. That was the result of what they had to see. One of the soldiers committed suicide on the day his service tenure expired."¹⁷

The horrifying massacre in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Chatila, where several thousand civilians were slaughtered, was the terrible culmination of the Zionist-genocide. The Palestinian camps of Sabra and Chatila have lined up in one tragic row with Khatyn (Byelorussia), Oradour-sur-Glane (France), Lidice (Czechoslovakia), Babi Yar (the Ukraine), and Sonmy (Vietnam).

The Israeli aggressors were bent on destroying monuments and institutions of culture and science. Thus, the building of Arab University and the Exhibition Hall of the works of art and culture of Palestinian artists were reduced to rubble by Israeli shelling and bombing. The archives of the Palestinian Research Centre were barbarously plundered. Many monuments of the Phoenician, Roman and Byzantine epochs, and the treasures of the Omayyad architecture were threatened with complete destruction. According to experts, the damage inflicted by the Zionist Vandals is beyond repair.

Breaking into West Beirut, the occupants went on a spree of looting. They stopped at nothing: furniture, radio equipment, books, clothes, telephones, etc.—everything was loaded onto trucks and driven to Israel by armoured carriers. The interventionists vandalised many private homes and offices, including the Beirut airport building and Barbir Hospital; they seized a number of foreign embassies and defiled mosques.

The aggressors rampaged in the occupied areas of Southern Lebanon with even greater impudence. They evicted Lebanese government employees from their offices and turned the premises into commandant offices; they blew up the homes of those people whom they suspected of collaboration with “guerrillas”. The local population was required to carry special passcards when using roads which were declared “military routes”. Orchards were cut down and fields burned wherever Israeli troops were stationed.

Having destroyed the military and political structure of the PLO in the South of the country, the interventionists launched a campaign of mass reprisals against those Lebanese suspected of sympathising with the PRM and NPF. As a result, tens of thousands of Shiites were forced to abandon their homes and become refugees, just as in 1978. The press also reported on the aggressors’ plans to “clear” Southern Lebanon of the Palestinian population completely by, first, confining the people to reservations especially created for that purpose, and then sending them to the North or beyond the Lebanese borders. Palestinian families residing in towns and villages between Tyre and Saida received letters and leaflets containing threats of physical extermination unless they followed “advice” and moved to the Palestinian ghetto in Ain el-Hilveh.

The Israelis and separatists also busied themselves with setting up local administrations and militia organisations composed of collaborationists.

Haddad’s gangs, which were plaguing the South, were widely used by the Israelis to pressure the Lebanese Government: when Lebanese-Israeli talks were deadlocked in mid-February 1983, the separatists expanded the zone under their control by seizing a total of one-fourth of the country.

Contrary to the deceitful declarations of the Zionist propaganda machine which claimed that the occupation of Lebanon was

necessary to ensure political stability in the country, Israeli aggression offered convincing evidence that the notorious colonial method of “divide and rule” could be used in the 20th century.

In mid-May 1983, the so-called “peace agreement” with Tel Aviv was imposed on Lebanon as a result of crude political pressure by the USA and Israel’s military pressure. The agreement’s main purpose was to perpetuate the presence of Israeli aggressors on Lebanese territory and to tighten even closer the Camp David lasso around the neck of the Arab people. It was designed to coerce Lebanon into linking up with imperialism and Zionism, remove it off the ranks of Arab and nonaligned states, and subordinate the country to Washington’s global policy directed against the USSR, the whole socialist community, and the national liberation movement.

During the summer of 1983 Israel redeployed its forces to the South, behind the Aвали river. This withdrawal to new frontiers was not at all a “peace initiative” as Israeli propaganda tried to proclaim. It was a matter of taking up more advantageous positions rather than withdrawing the aggressor’s forces from Lebanon. Redeployment was carried out with an aim to divide the country and annex its southern areas. Thus, the Israeli forces would be concentrated in one striking force aimed against Syria. Again, the invaders withdrew from the mountainous areas only, where they had suffered greater losses. Strong fortifications were erected by the Tel Aviv military along the new front.

The “peace agreement” forced upon the Lebanese and the interventionists’ reprisals, however, failed to repress the fighting spirit of the Lebanese people. The scope of resistance to the aggressors was growing. The unity of patriotic forces found organisational form in July 1983 when the National Salvation Front was created (NSF) and demanded that the humiliating agreement with Israel be abrogated. The Front was strongly supported by the Shiite movement Amal. In the end, Washington and Tel Aviv failed to win concessions from Syria. In fact, “peace-making” efforts that were carried out amidst Israel’s military pressure on Lebanon led the USA into a blind alley.

The United States then resorted to direct armed interference in the internal affairs of the Lebanese Republic. First the American marines, and then the navy artillery and the 6th Fleet air force opened fire on Lebanese, Palestinian, and Syrian positions.

By directly joining the fighting against the NPF on the side of the Lebanese army operating under the control of the Phalangists, Washington made itself a participant of the internecine war in Lebanon.

The world press was justified in linking the escalation of US armed interference in Lebanon with the anti-Arab "strategic accord" formalised in late November 1983 at the Washington talks between Prime Minister Shamir and President Reagan. The aggressive American-Israeli alliance was hoisted to a qualitatively new level at this meeting. The partners set up a bilateral military-political committee, which discussed at its first meeting, in January 1984, the questions of conducting joint exercises, the deployment of American combat weapons in Israel, increased military aid to that country, exchange of intelligence information, the use of Israeli ports by the 6th Fleet, etc.

However, the situation in Lebanon failed to evolve in accordance with the American-Israeli scenario. In February 1984 opposition forces thwarted the Phalangists' efforts to seize Greater Beirut with the support of the army and to cut off the city's southern Muslim suburbs from the mountain area controlled by the NPF. The government of Wazzan was forced to resign. There was a split in the army: many Muslim servicemen quit and joined the patriotic forces. The February 1984 events, which led to the patriots establishing control over 60 per cent of the country's territory, showed the true balance of power in Lebanon.

Under these circumstances, the American marines, along with the contingents of other NATO countries comprising the "multinational forces", had to leave Lebanese territory, which went a long way in proving the failure of US policy in that country. However, the redeployment of American GIs onto the ships of the 6th Fleet was, in fact, a stratagem in the neocolonial style: "Stay while leaving". "Nothing has changed," Caspar Weinberger said frankly. "We are not quitting from Lebanon. The marines are being deployed 2-3 miles to the west."¹⁸

At the request of the opposition, which had several times seriously defeated the Lebanese enemy in combat, President Amin Gemayel abrogated the shackling Lebanese-Israeli "peace agreement" on March 5. The US-Israeli plans of involving Lebanon in the anti-Arab Camp David process burst at the seams. But the Tel Aviv Government flatly refused to recall occupation

forces from Lebanon and cast a torrent of threats at the Lebanese Government. Israeli Prime Minister Shamir brazenly declared that by abrogating the "peace agreement" Lebanon had signed its own death warrant.

Time will show what course events will take in the future. One thing is clear, the curtain has not yet fallen on the Lebanese tragedy. Israeli soldiers still occupy one-third of the Lebanon, and the guns of the 6th Fleet naval artillery are still aimed at the country. Neither Washington nor Tel Aviv is interested in stabilising the situation in the Lebanese Republic; they are trying to frustrate any efforts to settle the crisis on a just basis.

But another thing is also clear. The Lebanese people, encouraged by their success in the struggle for their national interests, are capable of winning a victory, whatever the power of its enemies' fleets.

References

1. See *La Rude Epreuve du Liban-Sud*, Beirut, 1981.
2. *The Middle East International*, June 18, 1982.
3. S. V. Mallison and W. Th. Mallison, *Armed Conflict in Lebanon, 1982: Humanitarian Law in a Real World Setting*, American Educational Trust, Washington, D.C., 1983, p. 5.
4. L. Rokach, *Israel's Sacred Terrorism: a Study Based on Moshe Sharett's Personal Diary and Other Documents*, 1980, p. 25.
5. See E. Dmitriev, *The Palestinian Knot*, Moscow, 1978, p. 140 (in Russian).
6. *Le Monde diplomatique*, November 1978, p. 2.
7. *Ma'ariv*, Tel Aviv, October 22, 1969.
8. Paul Jureidini, R.D. McLaurin, *Beyond Camp David. Emerging Alignment and Leaders in the Middle East*, N.Y., 1981, p. 64.
9. *Defense nationale*, P., October 1980, p. 115.

10. *Le Monde diplomatique*, mai 1981, p. 5.
11. Ibid.
12. *Pravda*, July 22, 1981.
13. *The Palestinian-Israeli War in Lebanon. The Battle of Beirut. Why Did Israel Invade Lebanon?*, Amman, 1983, p. 18 (in Arabic).
14. *Al-Ard*, Damascus, February 1983.
15. *Time*, August 16, 1982, p. 8.
16. *Al-Hababis*, Beirut, January 7.
17. *Afrique-Asie*, January 3-16, p. 15.
18. *US News and World Report*, February 20, 1984, p. 29.

I. Belyayev

TO TEL AVIV AND BACK

This article by I. Belyayev, a well-known Soviet publicist and scholar, is not based on scientific research. Its merit lies in Belyayev's live impressions of his visit to Israel where he had a chance to meet and talk with public figures, scholars, journalists, people of different ages and political convictions.

The entry was surprisingly quiet. Without saying a word, the young airport police-woman looked first at the photo in the passport, then at me, checked my name in the lists of "non grata" persons, and seeing it was not there, she inquired courteously:

"What kind of stamp do you prefer? 'Slip-in', maybe?"*

"It does make a difference?"

"Many ask for it".

I volunteered for an entrance stamp in the passport. With a smile, the girl allowed me into Israel. No other questions asked.

When our luggage was duly on the carts, we were invited to a press conference instead of the customs inspection. Clear enough. Soviet delegations in Israel are infrequent guests. Quite infrequent! That is why the interest for them is so great. Rather, enormous. Especially now.

"All of Israels' press is waiting for you."

Yaron Beker said so, who was meeting us together with our other friends from the Israel-USSR Association. He pointed out that there were people from influential Israeli dailies, to say nothing of the TV and radio, among the attending journalists. Not from Kol-Israel (Voice of Israel) station alone, but also from the one in service of the Israeli armed forces.

Was not it a bit too much for a first introduction? Well, perhaps meeting Israel in this way is not bad at all for a start. Con-

* When the entrance visa (in this case into Israel), normally stamped in the passport, is at variance with the interests of the entrant, it can be stamped on a separate slip of paper to be collected at the exit from the country.

sidering Friday. On the eve of a Saturday most Israelis settle in front of their TV sets waiting for breath-taking news.

"Tonight you are going to make 'news number one'?"

It was our friend Yaron who said so. A minute later we realised that he might have a point there.

Every seat was taken in the small hall where the press conference was to take place. Except for the divan intended for us. Flood lighting. I am peering into the faces of the crowd. What is behind them? It looks like interest is prevailing, although I had a momentary premonition that the meeting would not be an easy one...

Now comes the first question:

"Have you brought any news of reviving diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel?"

"No, we have not brought any such news..."

We recalled that the Soviet Union had always presumed that Israel must exist. It was common knowledge. However, we favoured a peaceful Israel, and we were against its aggression and expansion at the expense of its neighbours.

Arousal. I inquired from an aged Israeli journalist sitting next to me who in Israel was interested today in restoring diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. I got a laconic answer:

"Everybody."

When I stressed that the issue of renewed relations between our countries was insoluble when abstracted from time and space, that a positive settlement of this question was hindered, above all, by Israel's aggressive policy in the Middle East, I was immediately aware of disappointment among the audience. Some spread their arms grievously, others grinned.

Instantly came the next question:

"Do you consider Israel a fascist state?"

"We do not consider Israel a fascist state, it being quite obvious, however, that the occupationist policy of your government, especially its methods of warfare in Lebanon, are clearly of Nazi character."

As the clinching words of the answer rang out, an invisible wall rose between the Israeli journalists and ourselves. We rapped on it, and we cited tangible evidence, irrefutable arguments. All for nothing! We were not argued with. We were listened to, without hearing. The wall was impenetrable...

Could memory really fail the Israelis? Unthinkable! Were not most of those present on the other side of their fifties? So they could not help remembering everything connected with World War II. Of course they remember. But in their own fashion. That is "the rub". It is precisely their memories fashioned in their own way that made them reason in their own way.

What does it mean, 'remembered in their own way'? Could Nazism have several different interpretations? In Israel, as a matter of fact, it is possible. Most Israelis believe that Nazism means only gas chambers. Those horrible ones that smoked in Mайданек, Treblinka and other Nazi death camps. Fighters against Nazism were victimised there, European Jews among them.

"The war in Lebanon has nothing in common with Nazism," our opponents said. "Israel and Nazism are antipodes."

True enough, there are no gas chambers in Lebanon, but the savage war against defenseless civilian population in defiance of the Geneva conventions and other norms of international law, in all actuality, is going on up to this very day. But there exists the "Ansar" concentration camp where people are being tortured, where prisoners die "attempting to escape"! The massacre in Sabra and Chatila, bombing raids on 17 Palestinian refugee camps lasting for hours, with thousands of children, women, old people killed. . . Who will have the nerve to deny all that?

"Are not Israelites themselves talking of the Judaism-Nazism explosion today as Professor Leibovitz of Jerusalem University has done, for example?"

"The policy of the current Israeli Government is a Judaist-Nazi policy. We have done what Hitler did after six years in power."

That is how Professor Jeshaayahu Leibovitz appraised Begin's policy, all that has been perpetrated in Lebanon after the invasion of the Israeli army there. The prominent Israeli chemist made this statement when speaking at a press conference in London in the summer of 1982. Is not what we have said backed up by his uncompromising logic? Is there anyone among those present here who would dare to disprove professor Leibovitz?

The reaction to my counterquestion was somewhat delayed. A tall Israeli of some age was sitting in the corner to my right. He was not missing a word of what was said during the press con-

ference. It seemed to me that I had met him somewhere and even talked to him. Where, when? Could it be in January 1974, at the 101st kilometre of the Cairo-Suez highway? It was for the first time then that I happened to meet Israeli journalists face-to-face, as the phrase goes. In memory of that encounter I am keeping a notable entry in my diary: "Just human beings!". Today their colleagues caused a substantial revision of that judgement. Israeli journalists' position is somewhat dubious: they intimated to us that, while Professor Leibovitz was free to speculate on the Judaism-Nazism explosion, we had better not... Not that we were prohibited to do it, but that traits of fascism in Israel had better be left alone!

Such was the second stereotype in the Israelis' perceptions and judgements (the first one concerned the interpretation of fascism) that we were faced with in Tel Aviv within the first hours of our visit in Israel. Little by little it dawned on me: stereotypes in Israel were being created by the Israelis not for 'internal consumption' only. No, they more than just believe in them, but are trying to impose them on others by all means, sometimes astonishing...

What name should be given to this phenomenon? How about an "Israeli approach to Israel"? To me it looked very clearly programmed; interpretations of the true content of events occurring inside and outside the Israeli state, all appraisals with regard to Israel must always remain the unshakable monopoly of the Israelis themselves. Amazingly, the phenomenon observed is a fact! The reason behind Israel's cleavage with the rest of the world may lie in this very peculiar approach. And indeed, the 6th war of Israel against the Arabs—this time in Lebanon against the Lebanese and the Palestinian Arabs—for the first time in all the three and a half decades of the existence of the Israeli state, has sparked off protest, as acute as never before, even in the United States, let alone Western Europe, that has always been Israel's mechanical supporters in the past.

Begin and his supporters immediately retorted by accusing of... anti-Semitism all those who denounced "his war" in Lebanon! It failed. The denunciation of Israel continues. The parallel between the activities of Begin and those of the Hitlerites is being drawn ever more often. But the Israeli Prime Minister is still counting on general permissiveness and impunity. Why so?

For the reason that the European Jews suffered great losses during World War II.

“Yet, why must somebody else bear the responsibility for the crimes committed by the Hitlerites?” we asked in turn.

A pause. Again we were told that we were not justified in qualifying Israel as a fascist state. Again a pause. Now it was our turn to wonder. None of us ever insisted on anything like that. The pause obviously became too long!

I understood at last! The Israeli journalists gathered at the Tel Aviv airport wanted to justify themselves! To set themselves right with themselves, with us, with the whole world. Yes, really so, with us, too. Of course, they failed to choose the right form of self-justification. They were not ready to admit they censured the “longest war” of Israel in Lebanon and its obvious sliding to Nazism, to call a spade a spade.

The journalists besetting us at the Tel Aviv airport with what they believed to be piercing questions envied Professor Leibovitz. He dissociated himself! Though not all Israelis—far from all!—have reconciled themselves to their imminent responsibility for what has been done in Lebanon...

Suddenly, as if acknowledging that we were right, everybody started talking of a possible war with Syria. Some of these days, if not tomorrow. Something to the contrary, too, was said, though. My aged neighbour recalled the statement of Zeev Schiff, the military observer of the *Ha'aretz* daily, who stressed in one of his articles that Syria's cooperation with the Soviet Union nullified the danger of Israeli-Syrian confrontation.

Exactly at this moment the Israeli who was sitting in the far corner and listening to every word I said rose from his seat, came up to the table burdened with a host of microphones and straightened one of them carefully. It carried the engraved words “Voice of Israel”, which added absolutely nothing to my recollections. Yet...

Questions were being shot at us now at a machine-gun rate. Afghanistan was thrown into action. Pro-Americanism was being voiced in the reasoning of the Israeli journalists besetting us with ever increasing sharpness. Even West European writers meeting in West Berlin and deplored the sliding down to a nuclear catastrophe were not left alone...

The press conference was nearing its close when I was ap-

proached by a tall man. The one that was sitting in the corner to the right.

"Usef Dan," he introduced himself in Russian. "I am from Voice of Israel."

No, I had never seen him before although he looked like an old acquaintance to me. Yet, I did remember. His name! It is quite familiar, that name. When working in Beirut, I heard many programmes produced by Usef Dan. They were always anti-Soviet. His commentaries suffered from a similar kind of bias, to put it mildly.

"Would you give an interview to the Israeli TV?" asked Usef Dan.

I consented.

His questions were mostly concerned with the situation in the Middle East. But the opening question was different.

"What are your intentions in coming to Israel?"

"To see and understand the country whose policy I have been studying for many years without live contact, so to say. Now, I would like to clear up many things, if I am not interfered with, right here on the spot."

There was no telling if my Israeli opponents (and they were many) were satisfied with my answer. They might have expected something different from me...

At the hotel, Yaron told us he would constantly stay with us while we were in Tel Aviv.

"Regard me as your guardian angel. Anything can happen here, you know. So, please, stay in sight..."

We did not have to bother Yaron. However, he had to answer many questions.

"A tour of the city would be handy," Yaron offered. "I'll make sure you'll visit places of breath-taking interest. We'll start with the Square of Israeli Tsars".

Tsars in Israel? Yes, they were there. Solomon, David and others. A long, long time ago, in ancient Israel. Hearing the name of one of Tel Aviv's largest squares, I realised even deeper why the current rulers of Israel invoke history cult in permanently reminding the Israelis and the rest of the world of the far-gone past. The Old Testament is proclaimed the source of law. What law? The right to the war in Lebanon! The Israeli must believe that there he is "freeing" his land.

The bus stopped next to the square. It was decorated with a surrealistic sculpture. It was surrounded with a vast space. That was the space that witnessed the turmoil of the Tel Aviv demonstration of September 25, 1982. An anti-war manifestation of extraordinary scope and fortitude! Nothing of that kind had ever occurred in the country's entire history. 400 thousand Israelis, people of vastly differing beliefs, but unanimous in their striving to stop the war not only in Lebanon, but everywhere beyond Israel, convinced even Begin that they could not be ignored any longer. It was following that demonstration that Israel's Prime Minister agreed to set up an ad hoc commission to investigate the massacre in Sabra and Chatila.

I took a long time standing there on that grand square so full of the memory of the two opposed forces: the war in Lebanon and the fervent struggle against it, trying to understand what it was that motivated those Israelis who gathered on it in September. After all, the gigantic magnitude of the demonstration is not the only thing that matters. Certainly, it was not an easy thing to assemble so many people there. But something else was still more important. It convinced many that a menacing shift had occurred: there was no longer any national consensus existing in Israel concerning the question of war against the Arabs. I was told about this by the Israelis themselves, those with whom I managed to discuss what was going on in the country. That view was shared, not only by the adherents of anti-war movements, but also by some members of Knesset, journalists whose press reports are heeded. Could it be that the process of opinion ramification on the war in Lebanon, and moreover, on war and peace in general, is just beginning? Future will show what it is going to come to. However, the cleavage in the Israeli society is apparent. And it is deepening, considering everything that we witnessed in Israel. First ominous question marks appeared in the strategic schemes and calculations of those who determine that country's policy today.

What is actually meant? Let us recall that before the 6th war of Israel its governments, no matter who they were headed by, enjoyed full support of most Israelis. Communists and their supporters were the only ones who voted against in Knesset. And they found themselves in isolation.

“Of course we Communists and our supporters took part in the

September 1982 demonstration," Yaron said. "But even we did not expect such landslide magnitude. It is all over now in Israel with the isolation of Communists. . . ."

There were young people, intellectuals, employees, and even servicemen among those participating in the September demonstration that aroused the country so much. I brought from Israel an interesting souvenir—a clipping with the text of the manifesto of a large group of officers and men declaring publicly that from then on they were going to fight within the Israeli borders exclusively. They published this declaration at their own expense paying a sizable amount of money to the publishers of a well-known newspaper. Yaron sort of summarised, when presenting us with the clipping:

"You see, the fact of a declaration like this being published by our bourgeois press means a lot. Even the Israeli army is no longer unanimous regarding the war. Not in Lebanon alone. . . ."

It was quiet on the Square of Israeli Tsars in Tel Aviv on that cool evening. Not a soul around. But it seemed to me that I was hearing the turbulent passions that burst out in September 1982. I do not know what Begin thought then. Anyway, it is not hard to imagine. The Israeli Prime Minister understood that there had appeared a new factor in the political life of Israel, unknown hitherto—the anti-war factor. It has a tendency, which is also scary to the Israeli establishment, it is gaining momentum.

Our minibus was rolling slowly along the deserted streets of Tel Aviv. Everything around us reminded that the Saturday eve had already moved into the city properly, Saturday being revered in Israel as a religious day, associated with many taboos. Using any means of transportation is one of them.

In my thoughts I was still lingering on the Square of Israeli Tsars. Episodes from the anti-war actions of those who refused to turn suicidal raced through my mind. A question arose:

"Those demonstrating against war today, what are they going to undertake tomorrow?"

It was not an idle question. There are some who believe that anti-war movement in Israel is nothing more than a protest. Just that! The people gathered, rioted and . . . returned to their homes. They have no desire to form any anti-war party, nor do they have any desire to go into politics. Why?

"In Israel," Yaron explained, "intelligentsia, especially the one that is actively engaged in anti-war struggle, considers politics a dirty trade. Many Israelis, especially the so-called 'middle class', are reluctant to have a hand in it."

Hard as it was, but we parked at a small building. By the way, Tel Aviv is not a multistory city except for the luxurious hotels on the strand. We entered the doorway and were frankly astonished. We walked right into an advertisement about a coming show of Soviet films. Familiar titles flickered. We walked into a spacious library. Another surprise—racks full of Soviet books and magazines. When upstairs, we felt at home, like we had never left Moscow.

That was the House of Israel-Soviet Friendship in Tel Aviv. It has not just existed a long time, it has been working actively. This conviction came in the main foyer, where we met with most interesting personalities—delegates from anti-war movements in Israel. The gray-haired Uri Avneri, with the looks of a professor, from the Peace-Now movement, stood out among them. As far back as 1977, Uri Avneri proposed several draft resolutions in Knesset to Begin on accommodating the interests of the Palestinian Arabs. They were rejected. In the Israeli establishment they flatly refuse even to talk about a possibility of creating an Arab Palestinian state.

Among the questions addressed to us there was one concerning the situation in the Arab unity in the fight against the Israeli occupation. The man asking the question stressed that Israel would never leave Lebanon if the Arabs layed down arms—never! At least Southern Lebanon. In spite of the Israeli-Lebanese agreement.

We inquired about the future of the anti-war movements. The answer we got was inspiring. From the viewpoint of those engaged in the Israeli-Soviet dialogue, the anti-war struggle has a perspective, for endless funerals—of those killed in Lebanon—are not desired in Israel. Yet, they continue to the present day.

One more discovery—the last one on our first day in Tel Aviv. In the Friendship Club we were asked many questions regarding the position of the Soviet Union on the Middle East.

Sensing our astonishment—we were surprised at the ignorance of our conversation partners—a young lady participating in the dialogue took no time coming up with an explanation.

"In Tel Aviv one has to fight his way to the truth about the Soviet Union, about its policy," the student of Jerusalem University said. "The Israelis are constantly being misinformed about your country. Anti-Sovietism here is boundless."

I must admit, I felt awkward hearing this. Another question arose—the last on that evening:

"How can a country be hated that is doing so much for peace in the Middle East?"

Catching the gist of the question, the lady-student added:

"The ruling Israeli establishment cannot do any other. Its policy is blind anti-Sovietism. . ."

A. Semioshkin

ZIONIST POLICIES WITH REGARD TO JERUSALEM

Recently, the world press has not given a front page coverage to the Jerusalem problem. General attention is currently fixed on other acute Middle East conflicts such as the US-Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the protracted Iran-Iraq war. It would be misleading to interpret this as an acceptance by the world public of Israel's seizure of the whole of Jerusalem in 1967. The question of the future of Jerusalem is still an acute one and the Jerusalem issue remains one of the most complicated and delicate aspects of the painful Palestinian problem. If unsolved, this issue will render it impossible to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In view of the city's unique religious and historical monuments, which are revered by Christians, Muslims and Jews, there is considerable international interest in Jerusalem. The Jerusalem question can only be solved through international negotiations with all the parties concerned participating.

THE ROLE OF JERUSALEM IN ZIONIST PLANS

Zionist plans to turn the whole of Palestine into a racist type Jewish state have also shaped the Israeli Government's policy with regard to Jerusalem. Jerusalem, for centuries the centre of these lands, is considered by the Israelis to symbolise their "historic right" to govern the entire Palestine. To fit their expansionist ideology, Zionists claim religious and mystical devotion to Zion (Jerusalem). It should be noted, however, that for two millenniums following the destruction of Jerusalem by the

Roman legions there was no mass migration of pious Jews to the "Holy City". The Judaist loyalty to Jerusalem, therefore, did not become a disturbing political factor for the indigenous population, the Arabs.

A well-known Arab researcher, Henry Cattan, offers this evaluation of Zionist attempts to apply "historical argumentation" to justify their claims to Jerusalem in his book *Jerusalem*: "As a result of Zionist presentations, the impression is at times given—and taken—that history of any consequence stopped in Palestine in the year 70 A.D. and only began again with the Zionist movement under Herzl."¹

The Zionists stepped up their already widespread practice of evicting the Palestinian Arab population from Jerusalem on the eve of and during the Palestine War of 1948-1949. The war resulted in the Zionists' occupation of 12 of the 15 Arab residential quarters in Jerusalem located outside the walls of the Old City.² It was no coincidence that the mass slaughter of Arabs on April 9, 1948, by terrorists from the Zionist organization Irgun Zwai Leumi occurred in the village of Deir Yassin, which lies three kilometres to the west of Jerusalem. The objective here was to sow panic among the Arab population and to force them to flee not only Jerusalem but the whole of Palestine. The terrorists paraded the few surviving villagers in trucks through the streets of Jerusalem "to enhance the effect", while Irgun leaders held a special press conference on the same day.³ Israel's first President, Chaim Weizman "... did not disguise his feeling of relief describing the flight of the Palestinians as a 'miraculous simplification of the problem'."⁴ Cattan surmises that the number of Arab refugees from Jerusalem and its environs in 1948 could be estimated between 50,000 to 60,000.⁵

Even during the Palestine War of 1948-1949 the Israeli leadership considered the occupation of the whole of Jerusalem a top priority political task, despite the fact that the Zionists had voted support for the decision of the UN General Assembly to internationalise the city only a few months before. By the time the English withdrew from Jerusalem (May 14, 1948), Zionist armed detachments had seized virtually the entire city, including the central district of East Jerusalem, Sheikh Jarrah. They met with resistance only in a few Arab quarters, for example, in Musrara.

It was only because the Arab states joined the war on May 15, 1948, that the Arab Legion was able to hold back Zionist units on May 19, and Jerusalem was divided into the West (Israeli) and East (Arab) parts. In June 1967 Israeli troops seized East Jerusalem, thus placing the entire city under Israeli occupation.

ISRAELI EFFORTS TO LEGALISE THE ANNEXATION

On the day after the end of the so-called Six Day War, June 11, 1967, the Israeli Government, which included all the Zionist parties, began to press for the immediate annexation of East Jerusalem. The bill on the annexation, expansion of the city limits, its municipal status and the status of religious sites in the city was submitted to the Government on June 21 and approved at its earliest session on June 25. Two days later it was passed by the Knesset after the question of Israeli aggression had been transferred from the Security Council to the 5th Emergency Session of the UN General Assembly, which, unlike the Security Council, had no authority to use any sanctions against Israel.

As is known, Israel has no constitution. Instead the country has so-called basic laws as far as separate spheres of the state structure are concerned. The first such law, adopted when the state was formed, is the Law and Administration Ordinance, which determines legislative adoption and enforcement procedures, as well as the rights and responsibilities of executive authorities. The Zionists decided to use this piece of legislation as the juridical foundation for the annexation of East Jerusalem. An amendment to the Ordinance adopted on June 27, 1967, provided the Israeli Government with the authority to extend the juridical power of the laws of Israel and the responsibilities of its administrative bodies over any territory of "Eretz Israel". An addendum to that amendment contained the conventional geographic coordinates of the demarkation line of the annexed territory. Adopted simultaneously was Amendment No. 7 to the mandate Municipal Corporation Ordinance of 1934, which empowered the Interior Minister to expand the limits of the municipalities over any territories mentioned in the text of the Law and Administration Ordinance.⁶

Acting on the amendments to the 1967 and 1934 legislation acts, on the following day, June 28, 1967, the Interior Minister extended the jurisdiction of all Israeli laws, administrations, and the municipal authorities of West Jerusalem over annexed East Jerusalem.

Israel's Labour Party administrations in power before 1977 considered the possibility of a negative international Arab reaction and exercised a measure of caution in their approach to the question of Jerusalem. They did not rush to pass legislation which would extend Israel's sovereignty over West Jerusalem, much less East Jerusalem, or attempt to actually transfer the capital of Israel there, for they did not believe that such formal acts would play an important role when the time came to settle the issue of the final status of the city or its separate regions at an international forum. The primary concern of the Zionists was to ensure favourable conditions for actual control of Jerusalem and for the colonisation of its Arab quarters. They also made grandiose declarations regarding their claims to Jerusalem.

When Menachem Begin came to power, he decided it was time to dot the "i's". On July 30, 1980, the Knesset passed the Basic Law proclaiming Jerusalem the capital of Israel. The first article of the Law read: "Jerusalem, complete and united, is an eternal capital of Israel". Additional articles dealt with moving the President's residence, the Knesset, government offices and Supreme Court into the city, and also with protecting the "Holy Places" and ensuring free access to them. The Law was carried by the votes of the party in power, the Likud, and of 11 Labour Party deputies.⁷

Although the Law mentions a "complete and united" Jerusalem, the Knesset was not too specific about defining city limits and rejected the proposal of the author of the original draft, Geula Cohen, that Jerusalem's borders remain the same as established at the end of the Six Day War. This is because the extremists did not wish to have their hands tied if there were a possibility to expand the city limits in the future. Meanwhile, moderate deputies maintained the cautious approach they had practised with regard to Jerusalem ever since the time of Ben Gurion.

It should be mentioned that the Carter administration was trying to consolidate its relations with conservative Arab regimes

in that period and was therefore dropping some tactical courtesies to them. This was seen, in particular, in the voting at the UN Security Council on March 1, 1980, on the resolution denouncing the setting up of Jewish settlements on the territories occupied by Israel, including Jerusalem, and requesting their dismantling. The US delegation voted in favour of this resolution. Israel immediately reacted by activating the Zionist lobby in the USA, and as early as March 3, 1980, President Carter abandoned his support of this resolution at the Security Council for fear of losing the votes of the Jewish community. Thus the law on Jerusalem, passed in the summer of 1980 as Begin expected, did not meet with criticism on the part of the USA. Domestically, Begin's hard-line policies concerning Jerusalem, which at that time enjoyed the support of the majority of the country, actually helped the Likud Party win the parliamentary elections in Israel in June 1981.

The world community sharply criticized the adoption of the 1980 Law. Former Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban remarked: "Never before has there existed such a gap between Israel and a united world public opinion, including our friends, and even the world Jewish community."⁸ Even pro-Israeli circles criticised the Law because it gave no practical advantage to Israel in terms of enhancing the Government's formal rights in East Jerusalem, and, moreover, tended to further aggravate the Arab-Israeli conflict. The London *Times* wrote in its editorial on August 6, 1980: "The most striking feature of the new Israeli law making Jerusalem the country's 'united and undivided' capital is that it is quite unnecessary. It alters nothing, since the whole of Jerusalem was annexed by Israel after the Six Day War, and so has been in Israeli hands for the past thirteen years."

RESISTANCE OF ARABS IN JERUSALEM TO ZIONIST ANNEXATION

When taking political or legislative action with regard to East Jerusalem, Israel had to take into account the political and economic realities emerging in that part of the occupied territory. After a brief "shock period" following the Six Day War, the

Arab population of the West Bank was able to organise resistance to the occupation, in spite of some isolated, futile attempts of certain "traditional" leaders to find a common language with the Israeli authorities. The Muslim Council was set up as early as July 1967, followed by the influential National Guidance Committee, which was organised in August, and began to fight for the rights of the Arab population, and, particularly, to take action against the expropriation of Arab lands and the building of Jewish quarters in East Jerusalem. All segments of Arab society joined the struggle. Especially active were the Union of Students of the West Bank and the Union of Arab Women. Widespread armed resistance to the occupation had unfolded by the summer of 1968.

Israeli authorities responded by mass reprisals, throwing thousands of Arabs into prison and completely banning political, union and even cultural activities in the occupied territory. At the same time, the Israeli Government had a measure of interest in normalising the situation in order to encourage Jewish immigrants to move into the city and to facilitate control over the Arab population. To this end, it took steps to alleviate religious tensions with the Muslims (this topic will later be discussed in greater detail), and at least partially improved the economic situation in East Jerusalem and on the West Bank of the Jordan. In spite of the legislation of 1967, the Arabs in East Jerusalem retained the same socio-economic and juridical status as the population of the occupied West Bank. In other words, the Arabs in Jerusalem remained citizens of Jordan, though they were issued Israeli identification cards. The Jerusalem Chamber of Commerce headed the struggle of the businessmen against the Israeli taxation and customs tariffs being introduced in the Eastern sector of the city. The Arabs having free professions refused to take Israeli qualification examinations, while business and some other firms refused to acquire Israeli licences. Israeli laws were imposed on newly created Arab firms only. The efforts of the Israeli Government to introduce Israeli curricula in Arab secondary schools and institutes of higher learning likewise ended in failure. After many years of struggle, a decision was made in 1975 to allow high school students to choose between the curriculum offered for the Arabs residing in Israel and that for the Arabs residing on the West Bank. All Jerusalem Arab students

preferred the latter curriculum, which was identical with the Jordanian one, as it would enable the students to continue their education at schools in Arab states.⁹

The annexation of East Jerusalem together with the propaganda campaign about a “united and undivided” city cannot alter existing realities: to this day, Jerusalem consists of two mutually hostile sectors with different political ideologies, ethnic backgrounds and religions. The process of separation between the Jewish and Arab communities began long before 1967, when mass Zionist colonisation of the city was initiated. In 1967 a “revival” of the city was brought about through the occupation of the Arab sector. This served to aggravate conflicts still further and give them political dimension. The Israeli military authorities had removed only the physical barriers obstructing movement between the two sectors of the city. To the Israeli leaders, “unity of the city” primarily means the possibility to freely requisition land in East Jerusalem and build Jewish residential quarters in that part of the city.

This is what the Israeli magazine *The Jerusalem Quarterly* wrote when analysing the present situation between the Arabs and the Jews in “united” Jerusalem: “However, also in the reunited city, Jews and Arabs continued to form two distinct communities with defined ethnic, religious and national identities, distinct socio-economic characteristics, and a particular geographic distribution... Both sectors continued to maintain their distinct business centres, ... separate chambers of commerce and professional organisations and even parallel fire brigades and first-aid services... Jewish private enterprises continued to be located exclusively in the city’s Jewish sections... All the new Jewish hotels built after 1967 ... actually arose on the Western side of the former dividing line ... Jewish buses retained the concession over West Jerusalem and the lines connecting this part of the city with the new Jewish neighbourhoods in East Jerusalem. This arrangement differed from that reached by local Jewish and Arab taxis, where both circulated freely all over the city... Personal matters (like marriage, divorce etc.) were left to the Christian and Muslim religious courts of East Jerusalem who continued to operate without being integrated into parallel existing institutions of Israel’s religious minorities, or even subject in any way to the Israeli legal system.” The maga-

zine emphasised in particular that "... Jerusalem remained, in fact, a divided city, ethnically, nationally, and most of all, politically."¹⁰

As far as the economic aspect of the problem is concerned, the average personal income in the Arab sector is less than one third that of the Jewish sector; moreover, economic dependence on the Jewish sector is almost complete.¹¹

Although the barbed-wire and brick walls which divided West and East Jerusalem were eliminated in 1967, the city still remains divided into two sectors by the so-called "neutral zone". According to the American *New York Times Magazine*, "the city does remain divided, honeycombed by complex psychological barriers more resilient than bricks and mortar."¹²

The scope of resistance of the Arabs in Jerusalem to Zionist aggression largely depends on the successful struggle of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, which has won great prestige and influence in the occupied sector of Jerusalem. The report of the PLO delegation at the UN Geneva International Conference on the Palestinian Question (September 1983) pointed out, "We have now entered a decisive fight to the finish in order to raise the banner of our people over Jerusalem, the capital of our free state." The declaration adopted at the Geneva Conference stated that all the occupying power's (Israel) administrative and legislative measures and acts which promoted change (or envisaged change) in the character and status of Jerusalem, including the expropriation of land and property there, and, in particular, the so-called "basic law" declaring Jerusalem the capital of Israel, were invalid.

The legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs in Jerusalem are strongly supported by the socialist states, Arab and Muslim countries, and, especially, the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, which created a special Jerusalem Committee in 1975 and the Jerusalem Fund a year later.

Zionist Colonisation of East Jerusalem. The Zionist occupation of East Jerusalem and the 1967 and 1980 legislation acts passed by the Knesset heightened the tensions between the two sectors of the city to a breaking point. The Zionists began a methodic colonisation of the Arab sector despite the many UN resolutions denouncing steps towards changing the status of East Jerusalem and its suburbs. Referring to the laws passed by the

Knesset in June 1967, Israeli authorities started confiscating privately owned land in the occupied section of the city. As for the land registered as belonging to Jordan, the Israeli Government considered it to automatically come under Israeli jurisdiction by the force of the same 1967 laws. The Zionist “mastering” of East Jerusalem was occurring at such a rapid pace that the authorities found it necessary to rescind a long-time regulation which required the archeological study of plots of land in Jerusalem prior to the start of any development projects. Cattan observed: “As to the two arguments on which Israel relies for its colonisation of occupied territory, namely, a ‘biblical’ right to settle the land of Palestine and a right to establish settlements for ‘security reasons’, the first is an absurdity and the second is a fake... The High Court... rejected the contention made by the promoters of the settlement for that the Jews possess a ‘biblical’ right to settle in the West Bank.”¹³

The colonisation process began not with land confiscation, but with settling Israeli citizens in the Old City and other areas of Arab Jerusalem immediately after the war of 1967. The political decision to settle Jewish residents within so-called Greater Jerusalem* was taken by the Israeli Government on August 13, 1967. In October 1967, a Jewish religious school was relocated into the Old City, while by December of the same year, the number of migrants residing there had reached 200. The migration of Jews into the occupied territories occurred not only in the city itself, but also in the corridor linking Jerusalem with the coast of the Mediterranean Sea and in the eastern suburbs.

To date, the Israeli Government has issued four decrees on the confiscation of major areas in East Jerusalem. The first decree, of April 18, 1968, covered 12 hectares of land along the Wailing Wall and in the Jewish quarter of the Old City. This expropriated land exceeded the total area of the Jewish quarter and extended into the adjacent part of the Armenian quarter.¹⁴ Only a few selected patches of land in those quarters escaped expropriation—those registered as “waqf”.** Historically, most of the Jewish quarter belonged to well-off Arab families who leased their houses to Jews. During the Israeli occupation of East

* Jerusalem within the borders as established by the Israeli authorities on June 27, 1967.

** An Arab term denoting lands belonging to mosques (*Ed.*).

Jerusalem the Old City's Jewish quarter expanded to four times its pre-1948 size.¹⁵

Large-scale development of Jewish quarters in the city's Arab sector began when Israeli authorities requisitioned 340 hectares of land on January 1, 1969, to build highrise buildings in the Ramat Eshkol and Givat Shapira (former French Hill) quarters that linked the Jewish sector of the city with the Israeli enclave on Mount Scopus. The third and the largest requisitioning of land in East Jerusalem, 1,620 hectares (16.2 sq. km), was made on August 20, 1970. The Jewish quarters of Gillo and East Talpiyyot are being developed on that land in the south and Ramot quarter in the north.

The requisitioning of isolated patches of land in East Jerusalem has continued. The latest major action was the expropriation of about 450 hectares of land on March 11, 1980, for the purpose of linking together the quarters of Newe Ya'akov and Givat Shapira which lie 8 kilometres apart.¹⁶ Pisgat Omar, a part of a 12,000-unit housing project, is to accommodate some 3,500 units for supporters of religious parties.¹⁷ Israel has appropriated a territory of about 24 sq. km, or one-third of the entire area of East Jerusalem. Moreover, according to Israeli sources, Israeli authorities have already requisitioned, or are planning to do so in keeping with their development projects, over half of the total area of East Jerusalem.¹⁸

The Mayor of Jerusalem, Teddy Kollek, wrote in 1977: "We built mainly on rocky ground newly incorporated into the city. We used no wooden land or land that was employed for agriculture."¹⁹ However, he failed to mention another peculiarity of the colonisation that was reported from Jerusalem by a Reuters correspondent in mid-1979 that the strategic value of these areas was taken into consideration in their development: they are all located on the hills, close to the major routes, making it possible to cut off the three major Arab centres from each other in case of need—East Jerusalem, Vifleem and Ramallu.

Considering the great expenditures required for speedily setting up Zionist settlements over the entire territory of the West Bank*, the Begin Government had to curtail somewhat its col-

* US sources estimate that settling a Jewish family on the West Bank costs the Israeli Government about \$90,000 (*The Christian Science Monitor*, August 17, 1983).

onising activity on other occupied territories, including East Jerusalem where, in the opinion of Zionist leaders, enough had been done in the first ten years of the occupation. Recently, private investments have been channelled into East Jerusalem to enlarge the Jewish quarters. The Israeli press reported in September 1983 that 125 luxury villas are planned for construction under the Nof Zahav project, mostly for American millionaires, at a total cost of \$20 million. The area to be developed is located on a hillside facing the city, the site of the High Commissioner's residence at the time of the British Mandate.²⁰

Colonisation of the Jerusalem Suburbs. The only tie between West Jerusalem and Israel's seashore plane before 1967 was a single road along a narrow corridor. Following its aggressive actions, Israel set up a number of settlements north of the corridor on the West Bank, including Givon and Modiim neighbourhoods, and started building the town of Givon in 1980. To fan out the southern part of the corridor, work was begun to quickly rebuild Gush Etzion neighbourhood, which had 4 settlements before its residents were evacuated in 1948 and now has about ten settlements including the town of Efrat where a few thousand houses were constructed in 1980.²¹

At the close of the 1960s, Israel's Defence Minister Moshe Dayan decided to "close" a state-owned area of 71 sq. km on the eastern side of so-called Greater Jerusalem, i.e., to ban all Arab business activity in the area.²² After the war of 1973, colonisation in that area was accelerated. The whole town of Adumim (the so-called "industrial zone") rose there after a few years, to say nothing of scattered settlements. The settlements around Jerusalem were given the "biblical" name of Land of Benjamin. Lately, the construction of such "satellite cities" has been given much attention. Thus, aside from the colonisation of Jerusalem proper, the city is being surrounded on all sides with a dense network of Jewish settlements.

Israel's Expansionist Plans with Regard to Jerusalem. Israeli leaders do not try to conceal their plans for expanding Greater Jerusalem. On the eve of the parliamentary elections of 1981, Begin already spoke of Jerusalem and Adumim as one entity ("We built 9,000 apartments in Jerusalem, including Ma'ale Adumim"). On November 30, 1981, *Newsweek* magazine published an article about Israeli plans for developing Jerusalem

which called for the building of Greater Jerusalem with a Jewish population of 500,000 by the year 2010.

The Change in the Demographic Structure. 194,000 Jews and 70,900 non-Jews lived in Jerusalem after the whole of the city was seized by Israel in 1967 and its limits expanded. Immediately after the cessation of hostilities, Israeli authorities launched a campaign to move Arab residents from Jerusalem to the West Bank and Jordan. The Arab residents of the city who happened to be outside Jerusalem at the end of the war were denied permission to enter the city for permanent residence. Since then, the Arab population has increased exclusively through natural growth and "illegal" infiltration from the West Bank.

The population growth in Jerusalem after the occupation of its eastern sector is shown in the table below (thous.)²³

Year	Jews	Muslims	Arabs Christ.*	Total	City's total population
1967	194	58	12.9	70.9	264.9
1977	260	90	13.7	103.7	375
1981	295	100.3	16.7	117	412

* The number of Christians includes both Arabs and non-Arabs.

The growth of the Jewish population is mostly accounted for by new immigrants, since internal Jewish migrations in Jerusalem were negligible. Most of the arrivals settled in the new quarters of East Jerusalem. Up to 60 thousand Jews resided in those quarters in 1981.

It has become known of late that in 1981 Jewish emigration from Jerusalem exceeded the number of Jews entering Jerusalem. According to Mayor Kollek, this process intensified in the two following years. It is explained by the fact that part of the city's Jewish population moved to new settlements being set up on the West Bank.

Most Christians (Orthodox, Catholics, Armenians, Greek Catholics) reside in the Old City. Most Arab Protestants live in the Northern Zone. As of 1978, the main Christian denominations in Jerusalem were: Greek Orthodox (3,000), Armenian Orthodox (1,200), Armenian Catholic (210), Greek Catholic (335), Roman Catholic (4,210), Anglican (200), Lutheran (400).²⁴ Most Jerusalem Muslims are Sunnites.

Religious Aspect. After the occupation of East Jerusalem, Israel did not care to reinstate the status quo regarding religious sites known as “Holy Places”. This principle has been in use for over two centuries by the Turkish authorities, the British Mandate administration, and the Jordanian Government (the latter did not extend this principle to cover the Judaic sacred sites at the Wailing Wall and on the Mount of Olives). Already on June 10, 1967, Israeli occupation authorities began to enlarge the area in front of the Wailing Wall by pulling down the structures belonging to the Muslims, including two small mosques, and by evicting 650 Arab citizens from al-Mughrabi. Moreover, the citizens of the quarter were allowed just one hour to pack, after which the bulldozers started destroying Arab homes. This barbarous act was in defiance of a centuries-old regulation, which was legally adopted and according to which the Wailing Wall, as an integral part of Haram-el-Sharif—the major Muslim sacred site in Palestine—and its adjacent area, were under the sole ownership of Muslims, while the Jews were only allowed free access to the Wall for the purpose of devotions.²⁵

But Muslims were alarmed even further by Israel’s intention to gain possession of Haram-el-Sharif itself, to open it for Judaic worshiping and erect synagogues there. A few hours after the seizure of the Old City, the Chief Rabbi of the Israel Army, Goreñ, conducted prayers in Haram-el-Sharif and then proposed to build a synagogue on the esplanade of Mosque al-Aqsa.²⁶ In August 1967, the Israeli Minister of Religious Affairs declared that, in his opinion, Haram-el-Sharif belonged to the Jews, as it was bought “in the days of David”.²⁷

In 1975, J. Hazan, one of the leaders of the Zionist Mapam Party, suggested in his proposal for settling the Jerusalem issue that a special place be fenced off on a mount where Haram-el-Sharif is situated for the Jews to conduct their prayers. The entire Muslim world was especially shaken by the Zionists’ burning of Mosque al-Aqsa on August 21, 1969.

It should be noted that immediately following the capture of East Jerusalem, Israeli authorities attempted to establish control over the affairs of the Muslim community, just as in 1948 with regard to Muslim residents in Israel. However, determined resistance from the Muslim establishment of the entire West Bank crushed these plans. Supported by prominent public figures,

Muslim organisations in East Jerusalem organised the re-establishment of the Muslim Council as early as July 24, 1967, an organ similar to the one existing at the time of the British Mandate. The Muslim Council appointed the chief qādī (a Muslim judge) of the West Bank, assumed the responsibility for appointing waqf directors and took control of Haram-el-Sharif. The Muslim Council was granted *de facto* recognition by Israeli authorities.²⁸ Israeli troops left the territory of Haram-el-Sharif as early as June 11, 1967, and on June 17 the shrine was turned over to Muslim organisations for supervision.

In March 1983, supporters of Rabbi Kahane, former leader of the terrorist Jewish Defence League and now head of the extremist religious Kach Party in Israel, planned an "operation" to penetrate Haram-el-Sharif via an underground tunnel. Armed with machine-guns and rifles, the men aimed to seize the major Muslim shrine in Jerusalem, the Dome of the Rock, and to set up a Jewish settlement there. The operation was planned for a Friday evening when the mosque would be full of worshippers. The attack was thwarted by the Israeli police who feared a backlash from indignant Muslims. House arrested were twenty-nine conspirators from Kiryat Arba, a settlement of religious fanatics headed by Y. Ariel, former rabbi of the city of Yamit (on Sinai), who was runner-up from the Kach Party in the parliamentary elections of 1981. Half a year later, in October 1983, a Jerusalem court found all the conspirators not guilty and released them.

This is but one example of Zionist defilement of a Muslim shrine. In April 1982, an American immigrant, Israeli army soldier Alan Harry Goodman, opened fire in the same Dome of the Rock killing two people and wounding 11 people. Another man was killed and seven people wounded by Israeli police trying to save Goodman from the wrath of the crowd.

Other religious fanatics, pupils of the Hasidic Yeshibah Birkat Avraham located in the Muslim quarter of the Old City, often attack residents of the quarter, threaten them with knives, shatter windows. They beat an Arab woman till she lost consciousness, vandalised the apartment of a Muslim neighbour, and also tried to break into Haram-el-Sharif.

As for different Christian church denominations in Jerusalem, the Israeli Government tried to reach an agreement with the Vatican which would give the Catholic Church privileges at

the expense of other religious communities, primarily the Orthodox Church. It was Israel's Ambassador to Rome, Ehud Avriel, who started the negotiations in June 1967. He proposed that the Pontiff sign an agreement according to which Israel would recognise the Pope as the coordinator of all Christian groups in Jerusalem. The secret negotiations continued in 1968 by Yaakov Herzog, Director of the Prime Minister's Office. The Israeli proposals included changing the status quo of the Christian Holy Places by giving the Catholics senior status at the expense of Eastern communities; by recognising the Pope as the representative of all the Christian groups in Jerusalem, and granting diplomatic immunity to the religious missions in the Holy Places. In return for this favour, the Israelis wished the Vatican to recognise Israel's sovereignty over unified Jerusalem. This was however declined, but the talks were continued by Foreign Minister Eban in 1969 and by Prime Minister Meir in 1973.²⁹

Acts of hostility and vandalism are being committed by Israeli extremists not only against Muslims, but also against Christian holy places and clergy in Jerusalem. Jerusalem was swept by a wave of threats and provocations against Christian organisations in the late 70s and early 80s. For example, Zionist thugs would attack a Baptist church and humiliate priests. They scratched profanities on the walls of the Bible Society, looted and set fire to a store selling Christian literature. Even officials from the Jerusalem Municipality admitted that Christian churches had suffered damage amounting to \$30,000. Christian church representatives sent an official protest to Prime Minister Begin on February 1, 1980.

A Russian ecclesiastical mission of the Moscow Orthodox Patriarchate has been located in Jerusalem for many years, as well as a Russian Orthodox Convent in Ein-Karem. In the spring of 1983, Zionist fanatics surrounded the Convent and painted "Get out of Here" on its walls (as well as on the fence of the nearby Catholic church). Two nuns (mother and daughter) were killed in their cell in May 1983.

In the period following 1967, Israeli authorities have given priority to trying to establish a basis in international politics and law for the occupation of East Jerusalem and for its colonisation, which is aimed at modifying the city's demographic structure in favour of Israel. Considering the religious aspect of the problem

and the process of Israeli naturalisation of the Arab population of the Eastern sector, these issues are currently being played down so as not to aggravate the situation in the city, which is already tense enough after the unsuccessful attempts in this direction made in the early period of the occupation.

References

1. H. Cattan, *Jerusalem*, Croom Helm, London, 1981, p. 93.
2. Ibid., p. 51.
3. Ibid., p. 44.
4. S. Flapan, *Zionism and the Palestinians*, Croom Helm, London, 1979, p. 302.
5. See H. Cattan, Op. cit., p. 45.
6. See M. Benvenisti, *Jerusalem: the Torn City*. The University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1976, p. 114.
7. *Israel and Palestine Monthly Review*, Supplement to No. 89, December 1980, p. 2.
8. *Yediot Aharonoth*, August 1, 1980.
9. *Jerusalem, Problems and Prospects*, Ed. by Joel L. Kraemer, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1980, pp. 112-114.
10. *The Jerusalem Quarterly*, No. 19, Spring 1981, p. 23, 41, 43-44.
11. Ibid., p. 14.
12. *New York Times Magazine*, December 14, 1980, p. 90.
13. H. Cattan, Op. cit., p. 87.
14. Ibid., p. 82.
15. *Middle East International*, No. 197, March 31, 1983, p. 20.
16. *International Herald Tribune*, March 12, 1980, p. 4.
17. *Jerusalem Post International*, No. 1099, 1981, p. 7.
18. *Zo Gaderech*, August 20 and 27, 1980.
19. *Foreign Affairs*, July 1977, p. 713.
20. *Jerusalem Post International*, No. 1194, 1983, p. 20.

21. *Yedioth Aharonoth*, August 20, 1980.
22. See M. Benvenisti, Op. cit., p. 248.
23. Compiled by the author, based on *Jerusalem Post International* 4-10, 1981; *The Jerusalem Quarterly*, Spring 1981, No. 19.
24. *The Middle East Journal*, Washington, Vol. 37, No. 1, Winter 1983, p. 60.
25. See "The Rights and Claims of Moslems and Jews in Connection with the Wailing Wall at Jerusalem", the Institute of Palestinian Studies, Beirut 1968, pp. 73-74.
26. See H. Cattan, Op. cit., p. 74.
27. Ibid., p. 73.
28. *The New East*, 1979, Vol. XXVIII, Nos 1-2, pp. I-IV.
29. See M. Benvenisti, Op. cit., p. 268-69.

S. Tarasov

THE GOAL JUSTIFIES THE MEANS

The goals and objectives of Zionism, as formulated by the programme adopted at the 27th Zionist Congress in 1968, presuppose, above all, the strengthening of the state of Israel, uniting the Jews of the whole world around the “cultural and spiritual centre” in Israel, gathering Jews in their “historical homeland”, the growing isolation of Jews in the Diaspora, including the expansion there of Jewish upbringing and education, especially among the youth. As formerly, it all sounds very proper and is intended to inspire the Jews in the Diaspora to new “feats” in the name of these “noble” aims, to create the impression that this is being done solely in the interests of the “Jewish people” and for their benefit. However, as one asks the question, whom does it benefit, on whose money and by what means is it being implemented, and, in general, what “Jewish people” it concerns — one realises that under this seemingly decent signboard a dangerous and costly adventure has been purposefully implemented over the decades. The main characters in it are international Zionism, that offspring and weapon of the Jewish big bourgeoisie, and the imperialist circles of the USA and other Western countries who are using Zionism in their military-political and economic interests. The alliance of these is restricted, for its source is capitalism with its bourgeois ideology and international antagonisms, which are invariably accompanied by chauvinism and nationalism. It is on this basis that political Zionism in all its different forms appeared beginning with the honed Zionism of the labour parties and ending with the militant “revisionist Zionism” of Vladimir Jabotinsky. In accordance with the socio-political outlook in the Diaspora countries, and the concrete objectives being pursued, the correlation of forces on the in-

ternational arena and the interests of its chief ally at a given stage Zionism changed its colouring, but never its essence.

The Zionists have never scrupled as to the choice of means and methods for achieving their goals. Murder, terror, blackmail and threats, intrigues and slander, treachery and lies—this is a far from complete list of means in the arsenal of international Zionism. Nevertheless, Zionism has always sought to preserve its outward attractiveness for all social strata of Jewry through recourse to demagogic slogans and pseudo-socialistic phraseology. However, at the present stage, which is characterised by a sharp ideological and political polarisation between imperialism, on the one hand, and the forces of progress and socialism, on the other, Zionism is increasingly forced to disclose its true face. The groundlessness and reactionary content of Zionism's concepts and purposes are most clearly seen in the policy of the Israeli ruling circles.

At the 1977 elections in the person of the right-extremist government of Menachem Begin, the "revisionist Zionism" of Vladimir Jabotinsky, which for a long period had been in the opposition, advanced to key roles in Israeli political life. The doctrine of this ideologue of militant nationalism best of all suited the strategic plans of international Zionism and imperialism in the Middle East, which were aimed at direct aggression and annexation of the lands of neighbouring Arab countries, and at the suppression and exploitation of the Arab population of the occupied territories in violation of international law and the UN Charter. The invariable adherence to the tactic of the "revisionists", which was first used in mandated Palestine by the terrorists of the Irgun Zvai Leumi¹, was consonant with the adoption by the Begin government of a whole series of right-extremist political, economic and military decisions. As the official ideology of Israel, Zionism in the "revisionist" edition of Vladimir Jabotinsky determines today the home and foreign policy of this state, which is a constant source of tension in the Middle East.

It is common knowledge that the solution of the Palestine question is the key to a Middle East settlement, that is, the implementation of the lawful rights of the Palestine Arabs to self-determination and the creation of their own independent state. Let us try to follow the sources of the present-day obstructionist position of the Israeli rulers on this question. We address

ourselves to the “theoretical heritage” of Vladimir Jabotinsky, the leader of the “revisionists”. “All realistically thinking people, with the exception of those born blind,” he wrote, “have long realised that to get the Palestine Arabs to voluntarily accept the conversion of Palestine from an Arab country into a country with a Jewish majority, is something quite impossible.”² To break the will of the Palestinians, the “revisionists” created the above-mentioned Irgun Zvai Leumi terrorist organisation. Asserting the “moral right” of the Zionists to drive the Arabs from their land, Jabotinsky asserted that “the land belongs not to those who have a lot of it, but to those who haven’t any”.³ This slogan was adopted by the Zionist bourgeoisie, which began investing capital in the “colonisation” of Palestine by thousands of Jewish immigrants.

The illiterate fellahs had no opportunity to acquaint themselves with Jabotinsky’s “works” in which the hypocritical expression of regret in respect to the “insurmountable cultural gap between the two peoples”,⁴ the conclusion on the need for a “polite removal”⁵ of the Arabs and the inevitability of “some unpleasantness to the rest of the Palestine population”⁶ (read Arabs.—S.T.) accompanied by statements to the effect that “...the people whose defence is left in the hands of another people cannot advance conditions”⁷ in effect substantiated the methods of brigandage and territorial expansion, which subsequently became the cornerstone of Israeli policy towards the Palestinians and the neighbouring Arab states.

Comparing Israel’s social structure to a cream torte, Israeli publicist Uri Avneri noted that “the first layer is Israeli Jewish.... In the next layer are the Israeli Arabs who have formal democratic rights but, in practice, they are not genuinely free.... Arabs in the occupied territories constitute the third layer. They live under the worst type of colonial regime with no political or human rights. In the meantime, they are exploited as cheap labour without any protection.”⁸

Speaking at a meeting of the UN Special Committee on Palestine, Adeyemi, the representative of Nigeria, noted: “The Israeli concept of coexistence (with the Arabs.—S.T.) was therefore not one of equals but one between a dominant invader and the subordinate indigenous population, kept docile by a combination of military force and political and economic in-

ducements. Those were the classic devices employed by the United Kingdom and many other colonial empires.”⁹ In order to maintain this situation in the occupied territories, the Israeli authorities preserve intact the extraordinary laws of the period of the British mandate, against which the Zionists themselves had fought in their time. Today this colonialist legislation is being used to deprive the Palestinians of their national awareness, break their resistance, force them to become reconciled with their slavish condition or to emigrate. However, the areas seized on the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza sector are only part of the territory of the so-called “Greater Israel”, to which the Zionist followers of Jabotinsky lay claim. “In our Herzlian world view,” he wrote, “we do not recognise the right of citizenship for any ideal, except one: a Jewish majority on both banks of the Jordan as a first step for the creation of a Jewish State.”¹⁰

Almost fifty years later, speaking at the Knesset on March 2, 1983, former Israeli Foreign Minister and present Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir commented as follows on the official policy of the state: “We did not conquer the territories from their legal owners but liberated them from the countries that conquered them in 1948. We have not annexed them. . . . They are part of the Biblical lands of Israel and what is part of your country you do not annex.”¹¹

To substantiate the “Biblical right” to the “Promised Land” the Zionists widely resort to juggling and falsification of facts. However, they often lose all sense of proportion, and then the discrepancies and the gap between “theoretical” propositions and objective reality become quite obvious. In one section of his pamphlet *The Jewish State* Jabotinsky prophesied: “. . . in the future Palestine will turn into a laboratory in which there will be found by a special method . . . medicine for healing all humanity.”¹² And further, speaking of the special role of “the Jewish people” in creating the “spiritual culture of the world”: “But among them (other peoples of the world—*S.T.*) there is not a single one whose participation is as great in one sphere: the sphere of regulation of the social regime.”¹³

Even a cursory acquaintance with the conditions of present-day Israeli society and the policy of its leadership demolishes Jabotinsky’s “prophecies”. The world is often feverish due to the “medicine” called “Zionist practice”, which from time to

time is “injected” into the arteries of the international situation, and Israel’s social regime differs in no way from any capitalist state, save perhaps by its growing foreign-policy extremism and aggressiveness. Sharp social contradictions between the Sephardim and the Ashkenazim, a severe economic crisis and inexorably rising inflation (despite the colossal economic and financial aid of the USA and the West, generally), growing crime and drug addiction, speculation and corruption—such are the problems which continually plague this “laboratory”

Anticipating the inevitable contradictions between labour and capital, Jabotinsky proposed in his time the following “recipe”: “As long as the process of creating a Jewish State is continuing, a capitalist for us is not a capitalist, and a worker, not a worker. Both one and the other are for us material for the state that is being built . . . all forms of class struggle should be considered national treason.”¹⁴ One can readily see that this statement is in complete harmony with the theoretical propositions of Zionism, which reject class struggle and declare all Jews brothers irrespective of their social position, well-being and domicile. Criticising the Zionist thesis on the existence of a single “Jewish nation”, V. I. Lenin pointed out that “this Zionist idea is absolutely false and essentially reactionary.”¹⁵ Karl Marx in his work “On the Jewish Question” and Frederick Engels in the article “The Housing Question” proved that the concept of “Jewry” is unscientific, that the difference between the moneybag Jews and the Jews who sell their labour is as great as that between the wealthy and the poor in any bourgeois state. Therefore the advocacy of class peace only plays into the hands of the Zionist bourgeoisie, which deliberately cultivates nationalism and chauvinism, and in case of necessity unhesitatingly resorts to punitive measures against those who oppose them, declaring them “national traitors”. But coming into direct conflict with the “masses”, who are destined to build and perfect the classless idyll concocted by the Zionists, is pointless and even dangerous. Being aware of this, Jabotinsky nurtured a “plan of organising a mandatory National Arbitration in the conflicts between labour and capital”,¹⁶ which was subsequently realised in the form of labour arbitration for regulating disputes between workers and employers.

However, this arbitration is usually a mere formality. The problems remain unsolved, while the managers resort to fines and

dismissals. The strikes of workers and other employees in Israel are expanding with every passing year. After an almost half-year general strike of doctors in 1983, the government was forced to make concessions and partially to satisfy their demands. This and many other facts refute the myth of a classless Zionist paradise.

Despite favourable financial conditions for the country's economic development, the Israeli economy is periodically experiencing severe economic crises. The most recent one developed in connection with the aggression in Lebanon and entailed a 25 per cent devaluation of Israeli currency, reduction of subsidies for basic products, mounting prices on prime necessities and a number of food products, fuel and electricity.

Meanwhile against the background of steadily worsening living standards of the working people, the Israeli government's course towards an unbridled militarisation of the economy remains unchanged. The speedy growth of the military-industrial complex is ensured by the continuous flow into Israel of funds from all parts of the world. This flow is comprised of several sources: loans, credits (on extremely favourable terms), grants from the imperialist states (the USA, the FRG, Britain and other Western countries); donations from Jewish communities in capitalist countries and the spread abroad of numerous Israeli state bonds. These sources form the basis of the country's financial and economic structure, which is turning into a parasite state. As we know, the Zionist "donations" have been acquired through the exploitation of both the Jewish masses and the working people of other nationalities. Incidentally, the idea of "universal national loans" also belongs to Jabotinsky.

Of the colossal aid to the Israeli Zionists planned by the United States, which is to rise to the sum of \$1,700 million in 1983-1984, over \$700 million are earmarked for buying US weapons and military equipment, which is designed to ensure that Israel's conception of "national interests" be "compatible in all significant details with American objectives, both declared and implicit".¹⁷ This alliance with the most aggressive imperialist circles, which are a threat to peace, is far from accidental.

When the interests of Britain and the Zionists in mandated Palestine clashed, the centre of international Zionism was gradually transferred to the USA, which became its natural partner

in the struggle against Britain for positions in the region. The fierce lobbying by the Zionist prior to and in the course of the Second World War bore fruit. From 1943 US government circles began openly to support the Zionist designs in the Middle East, taking into consideration not only their own strategic interests, but also the considerable influence which the Zionist big bourgeoisie had already exerted on the country's political life as a whole and the outcome of presidential elections in particular.

Relations between the USA and Israel are complicated in many ways, owing above all to the existence of not only inter-government and private capitalist ties, but also close relations between the two main centres of international Zionism—the USA and Israel. The 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel gave the following analysis of the interrelation between the USA and Israel: "The ruling circles of Israel are more than ever dependent on U.S. imperialism. Yet the Israeli ruling circles try to influence the U.S. policy in certain affairs, sometimes even attaining success in this endeavour, to promote the interests of Israeli bourgeoisie and zionism. Nevertheless, the interrelation of the U.S. and Israeli governing circles is basically that of Israel following the American imperialists' lead, the latter acting according to their own interests."¹⁸

The existence of an influential Zionist lobby in the USA substantially restricts, however, the possibility of Washington's direct pressure on Israel. This is particularly noticeable during election campaigns, when the Zionists are able to get concessions from the US administration in return for the votes of the Jewish electorate.

The widespread system of international Zionism, with its main centres in the USA and Israel, functions by taking into consideration the slightest fluctuations in the political situation. Concerned with the preparation of "reserves" in the Diaspora countries, the Zionists have always devoted special attention to the education of the Jewish youth in the spirit of "Zionist values".

Jabotinsky was aware of the appeal of Marxist ideas and the attractive force of their practical realisation by the Great October Socialist Revolution for the younger generation. So he devoted a significant part of his activity to anti-communist, anti-Soviet brainwashing of the Zionist youth. This objective was pursued by the creation of the Beitar youth organisation, whose slogan

was "Had nes" ("One Banner"). This slogan is explained in the new *Concise Jewish Encyclopedia* as the "single goal as opposed to the duality of socialist ideology, a goal in which the class and national objectives are united".¹⁹

We are dealing here with narrow nationalistic interests that are realised with the use of all available means. The fact that the Beitar's "spiritual father" Jabotinsky was from 1929 the leader of the Irgun Zvai Leumi terrorist organisation, which was responsible for the murder of innocent Arab citizens in the village of Deir Yassin and other brutalities with regard to the Arab population who justly opposed the Zionist expansion, will give an idea of the practical purpose of the training of youth in the Beitar. The continuity of Jabotinsky's ideas is felt in the present-day programme of the Beitar, which sides with the extreme rightist Zionist Herut party, which was for many years headed by Jabotinsky's associate Menachem Begin. Numerous branches of this youth organisation have been created in the USA, Britain and other capitalist countries.

A characteristic tendency of the Jewish communities of the Diaspora is the process of assimilation. Moreover, the tendency towards assimilation is higher in so-called *academaim** circles, the most educated social strata that are least influenced by Zionist propaganda. Taking this into consideration, A. Dultzin, President of the World Zionist Organisation, in his work *Eight Critical Issues*, devoted to the basic trends of modernisation of "classic" Zionism and its adaptation to present-day conditions, paid much attention to what Jabotinsky called means of "artificial isolation",²⁰ including above all inculcation of a feeling of superiority over other people, and cultural-religious isolation. The tactics of the Zionists is a stage-by-stage affair and includes: expansion of "Jewish" upbringing and education of the children and youth, including the study of Jewish history, culture, and the Hebrew language, accustoming them to Judaism, organising trips to Israel and their gradual drawing into Zionist activity. For the achievement of these aims numerous funds, programmes, and seminars have been set up in Israel as well as in other countries.

* The Hebrew word *academaim* is a broad concept, embracing people of the Jewish nationality with a higher education, professors and teachers, scientists and the professions.—S.T.

All this is done on a broad scale and is generously financed by the Zionist bourgeoisie. This activity is conducted under diverse demagogic slogans, but essentially it implies making Zionism one's personal world view, compelling one to actions, depriving the exponents of this world view of a class-social basis, forcing them to emigrate to Israel or actively to co-operate with the Zionists.

As we see, the objectives facing Zionism, and the ways of their attainment in the 1970-1980s not only have much in common with the ideas of Jabotinsky, the theoretician of "revisionist Zionism", but are a direct development and logical continuation of the course charted by him for an alliance with imperialism, territorial expansion, struggle against manifestations of class awareness of the Jewish working people and the national-liberation movements in the Middle East.

References

1. Irgun Zvai Leumi—a Zionist terrorist organisation founded under Jabotinsky's ideological tutelage and led by Menachem Begin before the establishment of the state of Israel.
2. V. Jabotinsky, *The Jewish State*, Tel Aviv, 1967, p. 3 (in Russian).
3. Ibid., p. 41.
4. Ibid., p. 39.
5. Ibid., p. 40.
6. Ibid., p. 56.
7. Ibid., p. 44.
8. *Middle East International*, 18 March, 1983, p. 13.
9. *U.N. Special Political Committee. Summary Record of the 29th Meeting 12.XI.80*, A/SPC/35/SR29, p. 14.
10. V. Jabotinsky, Op. cit., p. 46.
11. *Middle East International*, 5 August 1983, p. 13.
12. V. Jabotinsky, Op. cit., p. 46.
13. Ibid.

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 49.
15. V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 99.
16. V. Jabotinsky, *Op. cit.*, p. 55.
17. Leila S. Kadi, *A Survey of American-Israeli Relations*, Palestine Research Center, Beirut, 1969, p. 10.
18. *Information Bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel. Special Number. Pre-Congress Material for the XVII Congress of the Communist Party of Israel*, Tel Aviv, 1972, pp. 26-27.
19. *The Concise Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. 2, p. 487.
20. V. Jabotinsky, *Op. cit.*, pp. 17-18.

U. Olgin

CONTRADICTIONS WITHIN INTERNATIONAL ZIONISM: MYTH OR REALITY?

Over the past two decades Zionist ideologues tend to speak about the "crisis" of Zionism. From the rostrums of diverse Zionist "conferences" and "forums" one continuously hears hysterical lamentations over the fact that Zionism is being "forced into the background", that it is "incapable of accomplishing the tasks facing the Jewish people". This campaign is being artfully fomented by the Zionist press and the Western mass media which is under the control of the Zionists.

Crisis phenomena can in fact be observed in Zionism, but they are related, above all, to the crisis of the entire capitalist system, and also to the obvious viciousness and unscientific nature of the entire "theoretical" heritage of this reactionary ideology. As an ideology and political practice of the Jewish big bourgeoisie, Zionism is, above all, a class phenomenon, and hence its potential opportunities and development roads are directly linked with the opportunities and development of the entire imperialist system.

The tendency to parade the "crisis of Zionism" pursues the aim, above all, of distracting the world public's attention from the reactionary essence of this phenomenon, to create the impression that as such Zionism, weakened by its internal contradictions, is no longer dangerous and there is no need to fight against it. On the other hand, this tendency is designed to make the public associate the very concept of "Zionism" primarily with the state of Israel, or with Jews in general. This state of affairs is extremely favourable to Zionist propaganda, for it provides "grounds" for accusing the whole world of anti-Semitism, so as to give greater credibility to a basic postulate of Zionist "theory" on the "perpetual and ineradicable nature of anti-Semitism".

This aim is served also by the broadly trumpeted differences within international Zionism, as, for example, the differences on the question of the fate of the occupied Arab lands. Whereas the Likud bloc government in Israel is pursuing a course towards the annexation of these territories, the majority of Jewish organisations of the Diaspora come out against it in words, basing their stand on the assumption that the "absorption" by Israel of over a million Palestinian Arabs would damage its "Jewish nature"; in effect, however, they express the viewpoint of their countries' ruling circles, who want a more flexible Israel. However, the calls of the opposition Israeli Labour Party for a "territorial compromise with Jordan" and putting a stop to the construction of Jewish settlements in seized territories heavily populated by Arabs are purely a short-term expediency and are explained, above all, by the fight for power. Should this party come to power no fundamental changes in Israeli policy can be expected, including that with respect to the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip. Thus these differences are largely artificial and are not fundamental in character.

Ever since the creation of the "Jewish state" the Zionist leaders of Israel have attempted to orientate the entire system of Zionism as a whole on unconditional and complete service in the interests of this state. With this aim in view a campaign was launched for brainwashing the Jews of the Diaspora and, in particular, the American Jews, which is designed to subordinate their activity to the organisation of all-round aid to Israel, including directly influencing the US administration to this end. However, such designs continue to arouse opposition on the part of the American Jewish establishment. This is essentially a matter of rivalry between two groups of the nationalistic Jewish bourgeoisie—Israeli and American; moreover, the latter is unwilling to recognise the Israeli Zionists' leadership of international Zionism. This rivalry is a reflection of the contradictions peculiar in general to relations between the bourgeois classes of different countries. The Jewish establishment of the Diaspora, and above all of the USA, having failed to maintain its superiority, has taken a course towards the establishment of "equal co-operation" between Israel and the Diaspora, while simultaneously upholding its right to criticise certain aspects of the home and foreign policy of Israel, and also to take part in the

elaboration of the political course of the “Jewish state”. Moreover, seeing the inability of the Israeli leadership to solve many foreign and home problems, the Jewish big bourgeoisie of the West, above all of the USA, which participates in subsidising the Israeli economy and renders financial aid to Israel, is increasingly beginning to demand participation in determining the ways of the Israeli economy’s development, and also the general character of use of the financial means coming from outside. All this, naturally, engenders countermeasures on the part of the Zionist leadership of Israel. Things have come to such a pass that Israeli Zionists have begun saying that at the present stage there exist “two Zionisms”—“a poor man’s Zionism” and a “rich man’s Zionism”. The Israeli *Jerusalem Post* wrote:

“They believe their money should talk and that it should say exactly what they want it to say. They intend to take control of the Zionist apparatus in the Diaspora and in Israel as well, and to decide the roles everyone will play.

“What is envisaged, therefore, whether the Bronfmans, the Tishers and the Chinns realise it or not, is a rich man’s Zionism and a poor man’s Zionism. The rich will have second homes in Israel, possibly send some of their children to be educated here—the partial aliyah of Haim Ben-Shachar of Tel Aviv University—and will control the Zionist organizations in the Diaspora and the World Zionist Organization in Jerusalem. They will be powerful and important as never before.

“... What we are witnessing is a determined attempt to import the morality of the businessman into Zionism—rationalization, efficiency, cost-effectiveness.”¹

Thus when it comes to money, incomes and profits, the “single Jewish people” and “class peace among the world Jewry” are immediately forgotten, and the psychology of a businessman gains the upper hand. And it is no accident that the same *Jerusalem Post* wrote during the 30th Congress of the World Zionist Organization: “It [Zionist movement] has become a sapless shell, held erect not by a vision, but by distribution of privileges, echoing not with values, but empty rhetoric.”² The “organised Zionist movement” has in fact turned into a source of profit, a sinecure for the select among the “Jewish people”.

The fact that many, if not most differences within international Zionism, and also between the various trends of Jewish

bourgeois nationalism are determined by the differing interests of Israel and the Diaspora, tends to make the Zionist thesis on the existence of an “extraterritorial world Jewish nation” still less convincing. Rejecting this thesis, Professor Harold Fisch of Bar-Ilan University stated: “Israel and Diaspora are no longer the same people. We are bound by kinship and memories but we are moving in different historical directions.”³

Today, when US imperialism has turned Israel into an outpost of “Western values” in the Middle East, making it “the most reliable, most democratic and irreplaceable ally” in this region, the Jewish big bourgeoisie of the USA, recalling that it belongs to the “Jewish people”, is attempting, and not unsuccessfully, to use all the advantages of the existing situation. Israel for it is above all a tool for strengthening its own political and economic positions and influence. That is why the Jewish big bourgeoisie is doing everything possible so that Israel would in future too be a “strategic asset” to the USA.

To speak of a “poor man’s Zionism” and a “rich man’s Zionism” is mere demagogy. Zionism has always been, is and will remain in the service of the most reactionary imperialist circles. The majority of working Jews, however, are either indifferent to Zionism or, in one or another form, come out against it.

In this connection we deem it essential to deal briefly with such a fundamental provision of Zionist “theory” as the thesis on the “perpetual nature of anti-Semitism”, which is actively being used by Zionist propaganda to develop so-called “Jewish self-awareness”, a feeling of isolation, of a hostile environment, which, according to Zionist designs, should serve as an instigation for Jews to adopt Zionist ideology.

The “father” of Zionism, Theodor Herzl, wrote in 1899 in one of his articles that he himself was brought to Zionism “. . . by the new enemy which attacked us just when we were in the process of complete assimilation: by anti-Semitism. I am still aware what an impression it made upon me when I, in the year 1882, read Dühring’s book on the Jewish question (*Die Judenfrage als Rassen-Sitten—und Kulturfrage*), a book which is as full of hate as it is brilliant. I think that prior to it I really no longer knew that I was a Jew. Dühring’s book had an effect on me as if I had received a blow on the head. And that same thing

probably happened to many a Western Jew who had already forgotten his peoplehood. The anti-Semites awakened it...”⁴ The Zionists readily seized upon and actively used this “idea” of Herzl’s. From their viewpoint anti-Semitism is called upon to facilitate the development of “Jewish self-awareness” among the Diaspora Jews, to hold back the process of assimilation, and increase the “attraction to Zion” and thereby stimulate aliyahs. To achieve these goals the Zionists are prepared to undertake any adventure and even crime, totally disregarding the sad consequences of their actions for the “Jewish people”.

Still another illustration of the hypocrisy of the Zionist leaders and also some outstanding spokesmen of the US Jewish establishment are their active contacts and striving to “strengthen co-operation” with the Moral Majority, an implicitly anti-Semitic movement headed by the ultra-reactionary Jerry Fallwell. In the Israeli leaders’ view, the Moral Majority’s attitude to Jews is not the most important thing, what is important is their attitude to Zionism and Israel.

The decoration by Menachem Begin, then Prime Minister of Israel, of Moral Majority leader Fallwell with the Zeev Jabotinsky medal in 1980 became the apotheosis of hypocrisy and cynicism of the Israeli Zionist leaders. This action aroused the indignation of the US Jewish community. Although the policy of the Zionists’ rapprochement with the Moral Majority does not meet with a sufficient rebuff on the part of the leaders of US Jewish organisations, still some of them have expressed their dissatisfaction with the course of the Israeli leadership. Here, for example, is what Rita Hauser, one of the leaders of the American Jewish Committee, said: “There is also the perception that Begin speaks on behalf of the world Jewish community. Well, I did not elect him and he certainly does not speak on my behalf on many issues... I don’t have any doubt that Begin’s embrace of Jerry Fallwell alienated the majority of American Jews, who regard Fallwell and his group as a major threat to their political position in this country.”⁵

Israel’s drawing together with the American ultras is a fully natural development and is directly linked with the growing aggressiveness of US imperialism and, in consequence, the growing aggressiveness of the “Jewish state”. However, this convergence apparently has an ulterior motive. The fact of the mat-

ter is that both the Israeli ruling circles and the US ultras are objectively interested in fanning anti-Semitism.

Owing to their anti-Jewish prejudices, of which Professor Yehuda Bauer spoke at the 30th Congress of the WZO, the anti-Semites in the USA seek to drive out the Jews from that country. The *Jerusalem Post* wrote: "He [Bauer] also warned that the American Protestant fundamentalists, while pro-Israel because they want the Jews to return to Zion in fulfilment of biblical prophesy, don't want the Jews in America. 'They won't banish the Jews,—but the intent of their beliefs is clear'."⁸

The Israeli Zionists have a stake in fanning anti-Semitism to step up the stream of immigration to the "Promised Land".

However, there is still another force among the "world Jewry" that is interested in fanning anti-Semitism—the big bourgeoisie of Jewish extraction. From the viewpoint of this bourgeoisie, which is, undoubtedly, intent on strengthening Israel, anti-Semitism, apart from everything else, inevitably drives the Jews towards isolation from their environment and facilitates the cultivation of a feeling of isolation and alienation in this environment, thereby substantially easing the task of preaching a "class peace" among the Jews.

Thus it becomes clear why anti-Semitism, a phenomenon peculiar to exploitative societies, is not only not dying down in the West but, not infrequently, acquires the most odious forms.

We shall deal briefly with yet another thesis of Zionist "theory"—about "the Jews' age-old attraction to Zion". In this connection it is appropriate to cite the words of Naftali Feder, a member of the Knesset from the United Workers' Party of Israel (Mapam), spoken back in 1978 on the eve of the opening of the 29th World Congress of the WZO, but which are fully applicable to the present: "The tragedy of the Zionist movement, a movement that inspired hundreds of thousands of Jews to knock on locked gates, is that now, when the gates are open, no one is knocking."⁹

The fact alone that Herzl set forth in his time the idea of solving the "Jewish problem" by converting all the Jews to Christianity, and later called for the creation of a "Jewish hearth" in Uganda, reveals the artificiality of the thesis on the "attraction of Jews to Zion". The Israeli writer and journalist

Boas Evron wrote in this regard that "the Zionist 'solution' has proved to be faulty on several counts.

"First a majority of the Jewish people did not wish to emigrate from North and South America to the Jewish Homeland, thus casting doubts on the idea of a dispersed nation with an age-old yearning for a homeland. . . . Indeed, most Jews leave their countries only under pressure, and Israel is one of their last chances for a destination. The continuing Diaspora is thus a matter of preference, not of necessity.

"Second, the promise of Israel as a 'haven for the Jewish people' has been proved false. Apart from occasional outbreaks of anti-Semitism elsewhere in the world, Israel is the only country where being a Jew is dangerous, and it is the only Jewish community in the world that calls on other Jews to save it from 'another Holocaust', a threat its founding was supposed to avert. . . .

"The greatest paradox relates directly to Israel's lack of a cultural identity. No genuine Jewish national culture has yet developed in Israel."⁸

The implicit artificiality of the thesis of an "age-old attraction of Jews to Zion" is reflected in the different positions taken by the Jewish establishment of the Diaspora and of Israel on the question of Jewish emigration.

Attracting the Diaspora Jews to the "Promised Land" has been and remains one of the basic directions of the activity of international Zionism and the state of Israel. However, the deplorable situation in this sphere and the growing outflow of Jews from Israel* alarm the Zionist leadership, forcing it to seek new and more refined methods of influencing the Diaspora Jews with the aim of inducing them to go to Israel. Becoming convinced that the emigration of Jews from the USA, Canada, Latin America and the West European countries is very insignificant and cannot satisfy Israel's demographic requirements, the Zionists have since the late 1960s concentrated their efforts on organising the emigration of Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality, which, undoubtedly, corresponds also to the designs of US imperialism, which is interested in the emigration of Jews from the

* According to data of the World Jewish Congress, as of January 1981, 500,000 Israeli citizens lived abroad, primarily in the USA.—V.O.

USSR above all with the aim of subverting the unity of the multinational Soviet society, provoking a "brain drain", etc.

However, it is on this issue that Israel comes into the sharpest conflict with its overseas "brothers". This is one of the most sensitive questions of the "Zionist movement", which has become particularly acute since the formation of the state of Israel: the question of the "legitimacy" of the existence of the Diaspora and the obligatory nature of aliyah. The Israeli Zionist leadership and the World Zionist Organisation under its control insist that "life in the Diaspora is life in banishment" and that aliyah is obligatory. However, after a fierce struggle, the Diaspora Zionists and, above all, those of the USA, who come under the influence of "non-Zionist" circles and rely on the support of the US Jewish establishment, were able at the 29th Congress of the WZO (Jerusalem 1978) to achieve the adoption of a resolution stating that continuation of Jewish life in the Diaspora is a reality. Thus the Zionist spokesmen of the Diaspora, primarily those of the USA, achieved a kind of official indulgence for all who do not wish to emigrate to Israel. However, debates on the issue of the obligatory nature of aliyah are still going on today, as mirrored by the work of the 30th WZO Congress. At this congress two definitions of a Zionist were given. "A Zionist is a Jew who comes on aliyah or who is preparing to settle in Israel, Jews who merely donate money or offer political support are pro-Israel or pro-Zionist."⁹ Another, more vague definition was given by Arieh Dultzin, Chairman of the WZO Executive: "A Zionist is a Jew anywhere who wants and believes in and works for the majority of the Jewish people to live in Israel."¹⁰ Thus what we have here is an attempt by Dultzin—who is perfectly well informed that the 1.4 million Jews who are officially registered as members of Zionist organisations (a clearly overstated figure.—*V.O.*) do not want to go to Israel—to somehow reconcile the Zionist "theory" with existing realities.

Recognising thereby the fact that the overwhelming majority of Jews in the West do not want to emigrate to Israel, the Zionists deliberately close their eyes to the fact that the same thing is happening in the Soviet Union, that is, Soviet Jews, who are full-fledged and equal citizens of their country, do not wish to leave their homeland. However, since here the interests of the Zionists fully correspond to those of US imperialism, the Zion-

ists, under the smokescreen of assertions about the "oppressed situation of Soviet Jews", have launched a fierce campaign for emigration from the USSR. Fully manifested here is the hypocrisy and cynicism of the Zionist "champions of the rights of Soviet Jews".

It should be noted that from the outset a large number of Jews who emigrated from the USSR with Israeli visas refused to go to Israel, preferring to settle down in third countries and, primarily, in the USA. The number of such persons in recent years has reached 70 to 80 per cent of the overall number of Jews leaving the USSR.

Dissatisfied with such a state of affairs, the Israeli Government through the Jewish Agency and its embassy in Washington demanded that the US administration forbid entrance to the United States to Jews who have no close relatives there. Moreover, it demanded of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society not to render material aid to such individuals. However, in both cases the Israeli Zionists received a negative reply. The US Government has preserved refugee status for Jews leaving the USSR and continues to provide funds every year for their settling in the USA. More, on this issue the administration was upheld by the Jewish establishment of the USA.

Three basic conclusions can apparently be drawn from the above. First, US imperialism puts its global interests above the interests of its Middle Eastern ally. Realising that refusal to accept "refugees" would inevitably lead to a reduction of the number of people wanting to leave the Soviet Union, the USA is seeking first of all to use the Jewish emigration to subvert the unity of the multinational Soviet society. Second, the Jewish big bourgeoisie, which has become closely intertwined with US monopoly capital, fully shares the interests of its American "class brothers" and is inclined to forget about its belonging to the "world Jewish nation" and about the "national hearth" in Israel. Finally, it is also obvious that the Israeli Zionists are not in the least concerned about the "Jewish people", nor their condition. Pursuing their adventuristic aims, they are out to get an additional portion of cannon fodder in order to be able to continue their expansionist policy. Shlomo Cohen, a teacher at New York University, wrote on this score: "The Israeli position on the question of noshrim (dropouts) is illustrative. According to most

Israelis, Soviet Jews who choose to settle in the Diaspora should not be aided. A poignant indication of the distorted, egoistic prism which Israeli Zionism has adopted: Aliya or dump them.”¹¹

Thus the Zionist leaders’ assertions to the effect that “Zionist ideology” is not subject to crises, that it is only “Zionist practice” that is experiencing a crisis is pure demagogic. The contradictions within international Zionism are to be found above all in Zionist ideology, in the non-scientific and reactionary essence of its two basic postulates—on the existence of a “world Jewish nation” and on the “perpetual nature of anti-Semitism”. At the same time there are no contradictions in Zionist “practice”, the main content of which is struggle against the national liberation and revolutionary movements, rabid anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, nor can there be any, for it meets the interests of imperialism, of which international Zionism is a detachment. It is only a matter of tactical difference on some practical issues. While the Israeli Zionists insist on Jews emigrating only to Israel, the so-called “cultural-national autonomy” for Jews in the USSR, which might facilitate the development among them of bourgeois-nationalistic, religious, pro-Israeli, pro-Zionist, Zionist tendencies, etc., would fully suit the spokesmen of “nationalism in the Diaspora”.

Finally, it is also worth mentioning both the Zionists’ and the US administration’s periodical displays of a “crisis” in relations between the USA and Israel. Here is what, for example, *The Christian Science Monitor* wrote in February 1982, that is, two months after Israel’s actual annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, which aroused the demonstrative “indignation” of the US administration: “Today the two nations appear to be on the outs as never before despite the fact that a highly conservative, anti-Soviet president is in Washington and a highly conservative, anti-Soviet prime minister is in Jerusalem.”¹²

Correctly stressing what Reagan had in common with Begin, the paper, I believe, over-dramatised their “disagreement”. The periodical lament about a “crisis”, about sharpening contradictions between the USA and Israel is nothing but an artfully enacted scene that is intended to disguise the fact that these two extremely aggressive states have common interests. For the US administration it is above all an attempt to dissociate itself from the most odious acts of the Israeli expansionists, to justify

itself in the eyes of the public, and also a concession to the "moderates", i.e. conservative Arab regimes. For the Zionists it is an opportunity to demonstrate their "sovereignty", to show their alleged complete "independence" from US imperialism.

But today, as in the past, the "family quarrels" of Washington and Tel Aviv are merely propaganda farces. "Complete harmony" of interests of the USA and Israel, the anti-Soviet thrust of their foreign policies, the use of continued occupation of Arab territories to reach a settlement on the US-Israeli conditions—all this is characteristic also of the present development stage of the Arab-Israeli conflict. And all this was clearly manifested during the Israeli incursion into Lebanon in the summer of 1982. Analysing the advantages for the USA of the situation created by Israel, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger wrote that the war in Lebanon "opens up extraordinary opportunities for a dynamic American diplomacy through the Middle East.... And events in Lebanon should enable us to overcome the existing fragmentation of our policy and to relate in a comprehensive approach the three great issues of the Middle East: the Lebanon crisis, the autonomy talks regarding the West Bank and Gaza and the threat to Western interests in the Persian Gulf.... Lebanon can be another testing ground for proving that radical Arab regimes and Soviet backing offer no solution to any of the central issues of concern in the area."¹³

It should be noted that President Reagan attempted to use the Lebanese crisis to "galvanise" the Camp David process. Having imposed on Lebanon a "peaceful settlement" with Israel, the Americans took one more step along the road of implementing the policy of separate deals, which in reality cannot lead to anything but a new aggravation of the Middle East situation. This is borne out by the recent events in Lebanon, where the American "peacemakers" shed the blood of thousands of innocent victims.

Anti-Sovietism is a predominant feature of the foreign policy of both US imperialism and international Zionism. The common goals of the USA and international Zionism may be formulated as follows: not to permit the USSR's participation in any way in the settlement of the Middle East conflict; subversion of the positions of socialism and above all in the Soviet Union; fanning of tension in every possible way. The American

journalist Christopher Hitchens wrote on this score: "Today when Israel puts itself forward at a sturdy ally in the cold war . . . there has been a certain—how shall we say—coarsening of the Zionist position. Israel has become the natural friend of the overdogs in America and elsewhere. . . ."¹⁴

What especially infuriates the Zionists is that in the Soviet Union national discrimination and oppression have been eliminated for all time, and all preconditions for anti-Semitism have been eradicated. Contrary to the Zionists' assertions to the effect that "struggle for the Soviet Jews" bears an allegedly "national" character, this struggle is above all an expression of class enmity of the bourgeoisie of Jewish extraction with respect to the first country of victorious socialism. And in this enmity the Zionists are increasingly converging with international imperialism and world reaction.

References

1. *Jerusalem Post*, February 13, 1981, p. 6.
2. *Ibid.*, December 8, 1982, p. 8.
3. Quoted in: *The Jerusalem Post. 30th Zionist Congress Supplement*, November 16, 1982, p. XXV.
4. Quoted in: *Midstream*, November 1982, p. 13.
5. *Jerusalem Post*, April 25, 1983, p. 5.
6. *Ibid.*, December 15, 1982, p. 2.
7. *Ibid.*, December 12, 1982, p. 8.
8. *The Nation*, December 5, 1981, No. 19, Vol. 233, pp. 597-598.
9. Quoted in: *The Guardian*, December 16, 1982, p. 6.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Jerusalem Post*, December 9, 1982, p. 8.
12. *The Christian Science Monitor*, February 23, 1982, p. 3.
13. *Los Angeles Times*, June 18, 1982, p. 7.
14. *The Nation*, December 5, 1981, No. 19, Vol. 233, p. 605.

I. Zvyagelskaya

THE ROLE OF THE ARMY AND THE MILITARY IN THE FORMATION OF THE BELLICOSE IDEAS OF ZIONISM IN THE STATE OF ISRAEL

One of the most important questions connected with the problem of taking and implementing political decisions in Israel is that of the role of the military in determining the main directions and content of the country's domestic and foreign policy. The armed forces, which are at the service of the ruling classes, perform political functions, anyway. However, if the army begins to take part in the running of the state—and just such a situation has taken shape in Israel,—the distribution of functions within the state system of power is shifted, and the army acquires definite political autonomy. We are not talking about the opposition of the military to the civilian authorities—the Zionist leaders of Israel all stand on a single extremist platform—but about an attempt to show what “contribution” the Israeli army has made, and continues to make, to the realisation and development of Zionist conceptions.

The process of establishing the Israeli armed forces was characterised by a number of features which, in the end, caused the peculiar position of the military in this “garrison state”. First, the army, whose backbone had already taken shape before the state of Israel existed, was formed as a direct result of the confrontation with the Arab national liberation movement.

Secondly, Zionist armed detachments had been the most important part of the Jewish community's political system, and Israel in fact inherited the existing structure with a large military element.

Thirdly, by maintaining permanent military tension in the region, Israel's ruling bosses not only guaranteed the military firm influence over the course of state affairs, but were also unable to manage without it.

Fourthly, the fact that Israel succeeded in creating a military

machine which the country could not afford economically, is explained above all by the position it was and continues to be assigned in the realisation of the strategic plans of the imperialist powers, in particular of the United States. Although the interests of the USA in the Middle East are greater than those of Israel, the general direction of Israel's foreign policy undoubtedly corresponds to the goals of the United States, which has declared this country its "strategic ally". For this reason the main way of creating and maintaining Israel's military machine became a constant flow of foreign military and economic aid, 80 per cent of which came from the USA.¹

The prerequisites for the active participation of the military in political life and in the realisation of Zionist doctrines had already arisen during the Zionist colonisation of Palestine. This colonisation was aimed at creating a single-nationality state, which presupposed territorial expansion and the ousting of the local Arab population, and was accompanied by wide use of violent methods.

The Zionist intrusion into Palestine in actual fact began at the turn of the century, when the World Zionist Organisation (WZO) declared its aim as being to create a Jewish state. The Zionists, who represented the interests of the Jewish bourgeoisie, tried to tear Jewish working people away from the international struggle of the masses against the evil inherent in the capitalist system by playing on nationalist sentiments. They also tried to put obstacles in the way of assimilation tendencies amongst the Jewish population, and to provide better conditions for the business activity of their patrons.

The Zionist leaders, who had formulated their ideas as being "to settle the people without a country in the country without a people", simply ignored the fact that Palestine represented an original Arab country with its own culture and history. In 1919 it had an Arab population of 642,000, while the Jewish population was just 58,000.² Thus, to attain their aim the Zionists resorted to encroaching upon the rights of the local Arab population, which, by the very fact of its existence, hindered the realisation of their plans.

The Zionists succeeded in enlisting the support of Great Britain, which had gained access to Palestine after the First World War. Palestine had previously been part of the Ottoman Empire.

Links between the British Government and the WZO were formulated in the Balfour Declaration (November 2, 1917). Having supported the Zionists' demands for a Jewish "national home" to be created in Palestine, Great Britain was guided by its own imperial interests and hoped in this way to strengthen its control in this region, using the "Heimstätte" (national home) as a "buffer" protecting the approaches to the Suez Canal and British communications. As for the leaders of the WZO, their plans in respect of Palestine went much further. However, because of the prevailing situation they sometimes preferred not to advertise their intentions, which boiled down to the transformation of Palestine, and, possibly, of the territory of bordering Arab countries, into a Jewish state. Max Nordau, a prominent Zionist figure, remembered: "I did my best to persuade the claimants of the Jewish state in Palestine that we might find a circumlocution that would express all we meant... I suggested 'Heimstätte' as a synonym for 'State'... This is the history of the much commented expression. It was equivocal, but we all understood what it meant. To us it signified 'Yudenstaat' then and it signifies the same now."³

In April 1920, Great Britain obtained a Mandate over Palestine from the League of Nations, and in July of the same year Herbert Samuel was appointed High Commissioner of Palestine, on whom the Zionists placed great hope. Chaim Weizmann, the chairman of the WZO, wrote: "Sir Herbert Samuel is our friend. At our request he accepted that difficult position. We put him in that position. He is our Samuel."⁴

The Zionist leaders were banking on mass Jewish immigration and on providing these immigrants with land. Seizing land from the Palestinian Arabs and sharply reducing their number, the Zionists took a series of military, political, and economic measures, in which an ever greater role was assigned to military pressure. Intensified immigration in itself brought about a change in the demographic situation in Palestine. For example, in the space of one decade (1920-1930), around 100,000 Jewish immigrants came to Palestine.⁵ The policy of ousting the local Arab population led to an even greater change in the demographic situation. Literally from the first years of British rule, the Zionists began to follow a policy which presupposed not only buying up plots of land from Palestinian feudal lords, many of

whom lived in neighbouring Arab countries, but also the partial expropriation of small Arab property owners. In 1920 the Jewish community had 65,000 hectares at its disposal, whereas in 1945 the overall area of land owned by the Zionists was around 160,000 hectares.⁶

However, even this rate did not suit the Zionist bosses and military force was called on to quicken it. Making use of the cover of the policy of colonisation, Zionist military detachments began to play an ever wider role in broadening the scales of this policy, driving Arab tenants from lands acquired by Zionist funds and establishing settlements in the heart of populated Arab territories. These settlements, which were built according to the principle "wall and tower" marked a kind of "military frontier" of areas which had come under the Zionists' control—frontiers which were expanding more and more.

The Zionist military organisations included Haganah—an irregular military formation which was subordinate to the leadership of the Jewish community and the Jewish Agency, in which the Mapai Party had held a leading position in the 1930s; the Irgun Zvai Leumi and Lehi terrorist organisations, which were military offshoots of ultra-Zionist parties and groups; and the professional Palmach sub-units which had appeared during the Second World War and were affiliated to the kibbutz movement. Military organisations thus became a part of the political structure of the Jewish community. Here it is important to stress that all the main Zionist groupings, from the so-called "socialist" ones to those on the ultra-right, and irrespective of the tactics they used to achieve Zionist goals in Palestine, relied on armed detachments and considered military force an important element in the fight for the "Biblical land". This irrefutable fact disproves the Zionists' fabrications about "humane colonisation" and the role of "peaceful labour in the rebirth of Palestine". The close links between military organisations and the political institutions of the Jewish community laid the foundations of the military command's political activity. Even before Israel existed as a state the military command had been drawn into the decision-making process, and it kept this role for itself afterwards.

This conclusion does not only relate to Haganah, whose military command, which was connected with Mapai, in fact formed part of the ruling elite, but also to other military formations.

For example, after Menachem Begin had taken the Irgun Zvai Leumi leadership in 1944, this grouping, which had taken its lead from the Revisionist Party, began to play a more independent political role, and in 1948 the extremely nationalistic Herut Party was founded on its basis and formed the opposition to the Mapai Party.

Palmach, which was founded in 1941, was to a significant extent placed under the control of the kibbutz movement, which was associated with the right wing of the Mapai Party. In 1954 a significant number of its soldiers and commanders joined the newly-founded Ahdut Haavoda Party.

Operating as an instrument for realising Zionist ideas in Palestine, military detachments were called on to suppress the growing dissatisfaction of the Palestinian Arabs who were being deprived of their land and even of the possibility of finding work with Jewish settlers, being ousted from industry and trade and, in the end, forced to leave their homeland, all as a result of the policy of colonisation being carried out on a nationalistic basis. The confrontation with the Arab national liberation movement was one of the most important factors predetermining both Zionist military groupings and some peculiarities of their organisational formation.

From the moment the British mandatory administration was established until the Second World War, the Arab national liberation movement in Palestine went through two stages in its development. The first stage (in the 1920s) was characterised, above all, by an anti-Zionist direction. At that time anti-colonial trends were not sufficiently developed in the movement. According to the Soviet researcher V. Nosenko, "the reasons for this were rooted, on the one hand, in the flexibility of the British colonial policy in Palestine and, on the other, in the tendency of the Arab feudal lords, who headed the movement, to compromise, as well as in the inertness which had been still dominant amongst the masses."⁷

The British colonial administration, while undoubtedly, supporting the Zionists, was trying to "placate" the Arabs at the same time, demonstrating its "impartiality". It was with this aim that politicians time and again stressed Britain's intention "to safeguard the political interests of the Arab population of Palestine".⁸

Not wishing to strain relations with the Arab feudal lords, who had mainly directed the Palestinian Arab movement into a nationalistic course, the British authorities preferred not to associate openly with Haganah in the 1920s, which was suppressing the Arab population and often provoking it to demonstrate. At this time Haganah had separate armed detachments which operated illegally and did not enjoy the direct support of the British administration.

The position began to change at the end of the 1920s. In 1929, the largest Arab uprising yet seen flared up, catching the British by surprise with its scale and its emerging anti-colonial slogans. From this moment on, Haganah units began to receive British weapons.

At the beginning of the 1930s the national liberation movement of the Arab masses in Palestine entered a new stage, taking on an ever clearer anti-colonial direction and class nature. The British henceforth banked on Zionist military groupings, trying to put down demonstrations by the broad Arab masses with their help. In the middle of the 1930s, the British colonial authorities, who had become interested in reinforcing Haganah, began to render assistance to this organisation in the preparation of cadres, as well as in the development of strategy and tactics. The essence of the Zionist alliance with Great Britain showed itself particularly clearly during the Arab uprising of 1936-1939, which was aimed against the expansionist course of the Zionist leaders and the colonialist policy of Great Britain. The British actively used Zionist military units against the uprisers. "Thousands of young Palestinian Jews were armed by the British and organised in territorial units to help keep order, thus becoming the nucleus of official Jew Army, side by side with the clandestine Haganah forces."⁹

Direct military cooperation between Britain and the Zionists did not continue for long. Surprised by the scale of the Arabs' national liberation struggle, the British Government, trying to maintain its presence in Palestine, resorted to a number of measures which limited Zionist colonisation in this region. From this time, the Zionist bosses assigned yet another function to their armed detachments—they began to play an active role in ensuring illegal Jewish immigration.

Later on the crisis in relations between the Zionists and the

British administration deepened considerably, even though the main task of the Zionist leadership during the period of military clashes between the two remained the fight against the Arab population of Palestine, which "interfered" with the realisation of the idea of a Zionist state. Intimidation, terror and bombings on market places and in Arab sectors became the main methods of the Zionists in their efforts to drive out the Palestinian Arabs and create a state on as wide a territorial basis as possible. This policy reached its climax after the publication of the UN Partition Resolution of November 29, 1947. The resolution envisaged the discontinuance of the British Mandate over Palestine and the creation on its territory of two states—an Arab one, with an area of 11.1 thous. square kilometres, and a Jewish one, with an area of 14.1 thous. square kilometres. International status was to be established for the Jerusalem zone. Jewish leaders formally agreed with the UN resolution, but in practice they dreamt of a considerably larger Jewish state.

The evacuation of British forces began in December 1947, and was followed by an increase in military activity between the Zionists and the local armed Arab detachments. The Plan Dalat became the Zionists' main military-strategic plan. It assigned the armed forces the task of capturing as much territory as possible before the proclamation of a Jewish state, i.e. before May 14, 1948. Although the leadership of the Jewish community verbally condemned the extremists' activity, Haganah and Palmach both actively made use of terror. Terror became the most important element of the Zionists' policy concerning the Palestinian Arabs and after the creation of Israel was taken up by the Israeli army.

This was proved, in particular, by the organisational changes carried out in the Israeli army at the beginning of the 1950s to adapt it to the implementation of punitive and diversionary functions. We are talking about the creation of the Commandos, and in particular of the 101st sub-unit under the command of Ariel Sharon. On October 14, 1953, this sub-unit destroyed the Arab village of Kibia.

The state of Israel was proclaimed on May 14, 1948, and on May 31, 1948, the creation was officially announced of the Israeli army. At this time the first Arab-Israeli war was already under way. Many factors had caused it to start, amongst which an important place belongs to the Zionists' policy towards the local

Arab population, and its overt expansionism. Although Israel stubbornly claimed that the 1948-1949 military operations were defensive, the country's leaders tried to use the situation to expand the territory of the state as much as possible, and a significant part of the proposed Arab state was annexed to Israel. More than 900,000 Arab inhabitants of Palestine were forced to leave their homeland. "Although the history of the Jewish state had scarcely begun," the Israeli historian M. Bar-Zohar wrote, "one thing was clear—neither the frontiers voted by the UN, nor those obtained by force of arms in 1948, were the definite limits of the State in Ben Gurion's eyes. A start had been made, that was all."¹⁰

Whereas the Zionist leadership, headed by Mapai, had tried at times to draw a veil over its true aims during the British Mandate, not wishing to strain relations with the British authorities, any concealment whatsoever was discarded after the creation of Israel. The Israeli Government embraced the most extreme ideas of Zionism, which envisaged unlimited territorial expansion and advocated open racism in respect of the Arabs. The most important role in the formulation and realisation of these expansionist ideas belonged to military officers.

The "depolitisation" of the army, which was widely acclaimed in Israel, in actual fact signified the aspiration of individual political groupings to monopolise the "problem of security" and the formation of a kind of "personal club", whose members were the head of the Israeli Government and representatives of the military high command. The definite autonomy of the Ministry of Defence and of the military command in the structure of the Israeli ruling hierarchy was also supported in the beginning by Minister of Defence, Prime Minister Ben Gurion. He himself in fact took all decisions on military and foreign policy questions along with his entourage, which included representatives of the military command. But even after Ben Gurion finally withdrew, the situation did not undergo serious changes. The system of mutual relations between the military and the civilian authorities in Israel did not take shape under the influence of subjective factors—the will of this or that state figure—but reflected the natural result of the expansionist policy, which had led to the militarisation of the country's political and economic life.

Territorial expansion and the fight against progressive Arab

regimes and movements—these main directions of the Israeli course were realised by organising continual military raids into Arab territories and large-scale military ventures. In March, 1949, Israeli armed forces carried out an attack on Southern Negev and reached the Gulf of Aqaba, where the port of Elath was founded on the site of an Arab village. In March, 1954, the Israelis attacked the Jordanian village of Nakhhalin; in August 1955, the village of Khan Yunis in the Gaza sector; in November 1955, they invaded the demilitarised zone of Al-Audja, and in February 1955, organised a mass raid into Gaza.

These operations constituted the implementation of the Israeli military-political doctrine of “uninterrupted action”, according to which military action became the main content of Israeli-Arab relations, even if there was some domestic policy change unfavourable to Israel in a neighbouring Arab country. This military doctrine aimed at forcing the Arabs to submit to Israeli diktat was, in its turn, based on extremist political ideas such as the “theory of the Arab encirclement”. Even Nahum Goldmann, the former chairman of the WJC, noted the decisive role of military force in the Israeli policy: “The Israeli policy, conceived, determined and dominated by Ben Gurion while he was Prime Minister and continued by his successors . . . consisted in convicting the Arabs by a permanent demonstration of force that they should accept the existence of a Jewish state in their midst. The main elements of the Israeli policy—reprisals, counterattacks against the fedayeen, obstinacy—were based on the tactic of impressing on the Arabs by force that they should lower their flag.”¹¹

The fact that responsibility for implementing the official Israeli foreign policy line was laid on the army secured and fortified the significant role of the high command in realising a wider set of foreign policy questions, which included both regional and international policy, particularly the forming and strengthening of coalition links with imperialist powers. The military establishment has directly taken part in the decision-making process in Israel throughout the country's history, but its pressure in favour of toughening up Israel's policy as much as possible manifested itself most clearly on the eve of and during the escalation of the Arab-Israeli conflict to crisis stages.

Thus, before the Tripartite aggression of 1956, the high com-

mand, drawing on the support of Ben Gurion, managed to isolate those "moderate" elements which had grouped around Prime Minister Moshe Sharett, who had called for more restraint and for diplomatic channels to be used as well as military ones. Having pushed Sharett and his supporters aside, the military, which by this time had developed and coordinated plans for aggression with France and Britain, received approval from the government to begin military operations against Egypt. The Israeli Ministry of Defence took the task of strengthening links with the Western allies on itself. It only became possible artificially to extend its functions, to the detriment of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, because it was especially important for Israel to establish contact with those Western countries which could quickly supply it with weapons in the quantities required to follow an expansionist course and guarantee political support for such a course. The recommendations of professional military men naturally carried a lot of weight in these matters.

On the eve of the 1967 aggression, the military, which had expressed its solidarity with ultra-rightist forces, came out as a pressure group demanding that a war be quickly started. Having forced Defence Minister Levi Eshkol, whom they considered "not resolute enough", to hand over Defence Minister portfolio to Moshe Dayan and attained a cabinet reshuffle to their liking, military leaders there and then received the corresponding order from the government. As a result of the aggression, Israel occupied territory three times greater than its own. Three Arab countries were the victims of the aggression—Egypt, Syria and Jordan—and hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arabs who had been driven from their homes on the West Bank of the Jordan, in the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and on the Sinai Peninsula, all of which were captured by Israel, were added to the lines of refugees. Many of them were refugees for the second time.

The idea of the army as the only guarantee of maintaining the state was fortified in the postwar euphoria in Israel, and the stances taken by military officers began to determine the whole complex of Israel's relations with the Arab states to an even greater extent. The idea of "safe borders", which the General Staff had developed after the 1967 aggression, amounted to the presence of well-fortified frontiers far from the country's

vitally important centres supposedly being the main condition for ensuring national security. The tying-up of "security" problems with the annexation of Arab territories fully suited the Israeli leaders and reinforced their total negativeness towards settling the Arab-Israeli conflict. Evaluations of the situation supplied by top military officers led the Israeli establishment to believe that Israel had events completely under control and that the "neither war nor peace" situation would continue for an indefinitely long time, thus answering Israel's interests in the best way possible. The process of active "settlement" of the occupied territories and the way the Israeli Government torpedoed all initiatives on the Middle East led to the Arab countries taking military action in October 1973 to liberate the lands Israel had captured.

The October War essentially signified the downfall of the Israeli leadership's military-strategic calculations and of the country's military-political doctrine. The myth that Israel could fully control the development of the Middle East situation was also dispelled. As a result of the military operations, Israel lost around 4,000 and 6,000 were wounded. Materiel losses were around 250 aircraft (or almost half the air force) and 900 tanks.

The Israeli leaders needed some time to recover from the post-October shock, by means of the moral, economic and military aid of the USA. The wish to prevent the occupation of Palestinian lands being curtailed induced the Israeli leadership, on the one hand, to participate in separate discussions with Egypt under US mediation, and, on the other to intensify its policy of suppressing the Palestinian Resistance Movement. From the point of view of the Israeli rulers, acts of aggression against the PRM took on a special significance while international recognition was growing for the Palestine Liberation Organisation, which took a constructive position towards settling the Arab-Israeli conflict. Not only did Israel reject the possibility of the PLO taking part in the process of settling the Middle East conflict, it also continued to reduce the Palestinian problem to one of refugees in order to prevent the Palestinian people from enjoying its inalienable right to self-determination.

This line was reflected in Israel's military operations against the PRM and the civilian Palestinian population—bombardments of refugee camps in Lebanon, the murder of Palestinian leaders,

the repression of PLO sympathisers on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip, and the invasion of Southern Lebanon in 1978. The anti-Palestinian policy of Israel's ruling circles reached its climax in 1982-1983 during the barbaric aggression against Lebanon. The military establishment played an enormous role in developing and unleashing this aggression.

The Israeli writer Uri Avneri believes that the war was foisted on Israel by Ariel Sharon and Rafael Eitan (the Minister of Defence and Chief of the General Staff) with the support of Menachem Begin.¹² Of course, there is no reason to talk about the "passiveness" of other Zionist leaders. At the same time, the military bosses undoubtedly came out as the instigators and direct organisers of this military venture.

It was precisely military officers who made a material contribution to securing both the military and political assistance of the USA. From this point of view the visit of E. Saguy, Chief of the Israeli Military Intelligence, to Washington in February 1982 was very important. Saguy met with Alexander Haig and Pentagon figures and informed them of the military operation being prepared against Lebanon. As the Israeli observer Zeev Schiff wrote, "In retrospect, this visit was clearly a first Israeli attempt to engage the United States as a partner in its plans for Lebanon."¹³ This attempt to engage the United States was the very purpose of the visit, since by this time Washington already knew of Israel's plans to start a large-scale war. The USA almost immediately agreed to sell Israel 75 F-16s and 11 F-15s, as well as to provide an additional \$125 million in aid.¹⁴

Sharon met with Haig in mid-May and informed him that an Israeli military move against the PLO in Lebanon was likely to start at any moment—perhaps even during their conversation.¹⁵ As subsequent events showed, the Israeli emissaries met with full understanding in Washington, which gave the green light to the barbaric Israeli aggression.

The military establishment simultaneously took measures to place the working out of almost all military-political questions under its strict control, pushing the cabinet into the background. Sharon sanctioned the unprecedented extension of the Ministry of Defence department of the national security, which, along with the General Staff, was charged with carrying out major military and political tasks.

Crimes against the civilian population of Lebanon and obvious abuse of power on the part of military leaders provoked such a strong negative reaction both abroad and in Israel itself that the ruling circles were forced to create a special commission of inquiry into the circumstances of the carnage in the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Chatila. The commission's unfavourable conclusions concerning Minister of Defense Sharon, Military Intelligence Chief Saguy, and Commander of the Israeli troops in Beirut Yaron led to their being removed from these positions. Not one of these generals, however, was dismissed from active service. Sharon remained in the cabinet and is a member of the two most important commissions—the Commission on Defence and the Commission on Israeli-Lebanese relations. Saguy was sent to Central America to discuss questions of supplying Israeli arms and of cooperation with reactionary fascist regimes, and Yaron was appointed chief of the personnel department for the General Staff.

The fact that representatives of the military establishment successfully "survived" the commission's conclusions and obtained responsible new positions is far from coincidental. It merely illustrates the enormous influence of the military upper crust, whose activity ensures the stable influence of the armed forces on all aspects of Israeli life. We are talking both of high-ranking officers on active military service and of reserve officers who hold key positions in the political or economic field and have maintained their clan links with the army.

Since the end of the 1960s the number of political appointments among high-ranking reserve officers has been increasing sharply. Rearrangements also go on among representatives of the High Command who had earlier left the army. For example, Haim Herzog, who was appointed as a director of a large company in 1962, was later Israel's representative in the UN, and in March 1983 was elected President of Israel. At the same time, many high-ranking officers are actively involved in various political parties, although they do not have any official positions in this.

After demobilisation, a high-ranking officer's choice of career is to a significant extent determined by the position he held in the army. The generals and the High Command represent the most conservative part of the army and, in fact, belong to the ruling

Zionist elite. The question of a new appointment is, as a rule, decided while a general is still on active military service. Taking the exclusiveness of elite groupings in Israel and their typical nepotism into account, it can be said that their representatives, including the military, have the opportunity to exert not only direct but also indirect influence over the course of events in various spheres of state life by using family and service contacts.

When they leave the army high-ranking officers continue to be its representatives even in civilian life. They are called up when the need arises and often return to the army at the request of political leaders interested in guaranteeing themselves support in the military command. Amongst the latest examples we can cite D. Ivri, who was appointed Deputy Chief of Staff by Moshe Arens, the present Minister of Defence. In December 1982, Ivri, the former commander of the air force, went into the reserve and headed the IAI company. Arens, who had become Minister of Defence, persuaded him to return.

The role of the military as the guides and architects of Israeli policy showed itself most clearly in the occupied territories, where the army not only comes out as the executor of the decisions taken by the country's Zionist leadership, but also determines the specific content of these decisions. The Israeli leaders, having set the establishment of "Greater Israel" as their goal, strained every effort to annex the Arab territories captured in 1967. In August 1980, they declared Jerusalem the "eternal and indivisible capital of Israel", and in December 1981, the Knesset extended Israeli jurisdiction to the Golan Heights, which belonged to Syria, signifying their practical annexation. The ruling Zionist bosses are also carrying out similar plans on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip.

As we have already noted, expansionism is organically inherent in Zionism and to a decisive extent determines Israel's aggressive acts in the region. The expansionist line in Israeli policy showed itself most vividly after the ultra-right Likud bloc headed by Menachem Begin came to power in 1977. Begin, a former terrorist and supporter of the racist ideas of V. Jabotinsky, the leader of the Revisionist Party, repeatedly pointed out that he considered the goal of his whole life to be the unlimited territorial expansion of Israel. He picked himself a team capable of guaranteeing the fastest realisation of this "dream". The lead-

ing role in this team was to be played by Minister of Defence Sharon.

The return to Egypt of the Sinai in accordance with the Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli Separate Deal was viewed by extremist circles in Israel as "payment" for the annexation of territories on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip which were of far greater importance for them. The ground had already been prepared for this annexation. In 1967 a military occupation regime had been established on the captured lands and they began actively to be "settled"—settlements and military installations were built, roads were laid, measures were taken to change the Arab nature of individual regions and sectors, and the local Arab population was forced out. The West Bank and the Gaza Strip gradually turned into an economic appendage to Israel.

The military took part in the development and implementation of the occupation policy on two levels. On the first level high-ranking officers who held important governmental posts were drawn into the development of the strategic directions of Israel's course of occupation. The military bosses were the authors or the co-authors of the Israeli leadership's plans for the captured Arab territories. The most known amongst these were the Dayan Plan, the Allon Plan and the Begin Plan. Sharon, Weizmann, and Dayan directly took part in formulating the main provisions of the latter. It is not so much the formal affiliation of the authors of these designs to the army that is significant—they are all military professionals (with the exception of Begin) and all hold the rank of general—but the fact that these plans, in the words of their creators, above all serve to carry out military-strategic tasks (guaranteeing "strategic depth", "defensible borders", etc.). It is clear that the question of creating military advantages for Israel at the cost of capturing foreign land goes beyond purely military problems and acquires a deep political meaning. In particular, the Begin Plan, which was embraced by Sadat at Camp David and recorded in the Camp David documents and the appendix to the Egyptian-Israeli Separate Deal, envisaged setting up "autonomous self-rule" on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. It particularly emphasised that "autonomy" would be realised under strict Israeli military control and that Israeli troops would not be withdrawn but merely be redeployed to

“specially qualified regions to ensure security”. In this way, hiding behind the phraseology of the need to “ensure security”, the Zionist leaders are trying to maintain a permanent military presence in the Arab lands charged with preventing the very possibility of their being separated from Israel at some time in the future.

On the second level—the direct activity of the army in the occupied territories—there were confiscations of land, building work was carried out, the protests of the local Arab population were suppressed, and there were various punitive actions. The joining to Israel of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip could not be realised by direct annexation and, as the Israeli leaders thought, required preparation. Firstly, it required a sharp reduction in the local Arab population and an increase in the Israeli presence in order not to upset the demographic balance of the country in the future, something which could cause the Zionist idea of a single-nationality state to fail. Secondly, it was necessary to establish a new administration structure for the captured regions and attract Arab quislings (i.e. collaborationists). Thirdly, the influence and position of the PLO had to be undermined.

In order to achieve these goals the Israeli Government somewhat moved the accent in its policy on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, which had been developed and implemented with the help of the army and the Ministry of Defence. Sharon, who was also a member of the Committee on Settlements, played a key role in the formation of the course of occupation. He declared that there was a place for the Palestinian Arab state on the East Bank of the Jordan. The Defence Minister’s logic is clear: the Palestinian Arabs should actively be forced out into Jordan. This policy is being implemented by the Israeli authorities—around 30,000 people are forced to leave the West Bank each year, and there is talk of an intensification of this policy.

The most important direction of the Israeli military’s activity is repression of the local Arab authorities, of town mayors, of members of municipal councils, and of influential political figures. This repression reflects the desire of the Israeli ruling circles to weaken the Palestinian leadership as much as possible and to set it off against their own protégés. At the same time, in an attempt to lessen the opposition of local forces, Sharon, having an-

nounced the introduction of “civil administration”, resorted in 1981 to a new pretext for the regime of military government. He did not fool anyone—as before, the Israeli military authorities are, in fact, conducting all affairs on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. The attempts of the military authorities to limit the influence of the PLO and isolate its sympathisers by means of repression, intimidation and terror also failed. The Israeli policy in the occupied territories provoked the most embittered opposition of the local population since 1967 in the form of an uprising in the spring of 1982.

The Zionist leadership believed that, in these conditions, the PLO had to be defeated and its military and political positions undermined if the West Bank and the Gaza Strip were to be annexed. Thus, the logic of the Israeli occupation led to the Lebanese tragedy. Addressing the Israeli troops in Lebanon in the summer of 1982, Rafael Eitan stressed that the war represented a “once-in-a-generation opportunity to change conditions in our favour in the struggle over *Eretz Yisrael*” (i.e. Great Israel, which included vast Arab territories).¹⁶

Pursuing its expansionist goals in the region, Israel simultaneously comes out as a guide for imperialist policy in the Middle East. As it is known, the USA is trying to turn the Middle East into a zone of its undivided rule. In order to do this it is trying to weaken progressive Arab regimes and movements and to undermine the prestige and influence of the Soviet Union. In conditions when the significance of the Middle East has grown sharply in the USA’s strategic plans for deepening the confrontation with the USSR both on a global and a regional level, the significance of the US-Israeli alliance has grown even more, and Israel’s role in implementing US imperialist designs has also become broader. Washington considers Israel to be a most loyal and stable ally, and Israel’s military machine, which was created with the help of the USA, allows the White House to use Israeli military might in its own interests without replacing it, but merely by supplementing it with its own military presence.

On the whole, the Israeli invasion of Lebanon undoubtedly corresponded to the interests of Washington. It was aimed at weakening the advance detachments of the Arab national liberation movement, opened up possibilities for the framework of

Camp David to be expanded by the inclusion of Lebanon, and could severely damage the front of Arab states opposing Israel—from which Egypt had already been dismissed because of the Camp David deal,—lead to an intensification of American military involvement in the Middle East, and weaken the influence of the USSR.

The Israeli aggression against Lebanon was carried out against the background of a new stage of development of American-Israeli military-political links. In November 1981, the USA signed the Memorandum on Mutual Understanding in the Sphere of Strategic Cooperation with Israel. The trend to formalise the American-Israeli alliance had appeared a long time previously and was reflected in a number of joint memoranda on the military-political sphere which were formulated with the active participation of the Israeli military bosses. At the same time, the memorandum on strategic cooperation gave American-Israeli relations new characteristics. The extreme anti-Soviet direction of the document bears witness to the USA's intention to make even greater use of Israel and its armed forces to realise its strategy of putting pressure upon the world national liberation anti-imperialist movement and the socialist community. Although this memorandum was frozen by the USA in response to the decision of the Israeli authorities to annex the Golan Heights, which it captured from Syria in 1967, this did not have any influence on American-Israeli relations. This move on the part of Washington was dictated merely by considerations of American manoeuvring in the Arab world. At the end of 1983, the United States, having taken a big gamble on using military force in the Middle East, finally formalised its military-political links with Israel by concluding a new strategic agreement. It envisages creating a joint military committee to coordinate operations more precisely, carrying out manoeuvres, stockpiling American weapons and ammunition on Israeli territory, increasing the amount of free military aid, and the resumption of supplies of the latest types of weaponry. Consequently, the Israeli military command and the military establishment as a whole are gaining the possibility of broadening their role in the development and implementation of the aggressive course of the Zionist rulers of Israel, who, ignoring the real interests of their country, have turned it into the gendarme of the Middle East and condemned

their people to living in conditions of permanent military tension.

However, despite the fact that Israel has been turned into a military camp by the Zionists, and despite the wild outburst of chauvinism and the cultivation of the population in a spirit of racism and intolerance, which is also being carried out in the army, voices of protest against the adventuristic policy of the ruling circles are heard in Israel. The government for the first time failed to reach a consensus in the country on a nationalistic basis during the military operations. To a certain extent the consequences of the Lebanese war also influenced Prime Minister Begin's decision to retire, although he tried to leave his position to his party associate and terrorist colleague, Moshe Shamir.

The war in Lebanon also provoked protests amongst the Israeli population. Thousands of people came out onto the streets demanding an end to the bloody slaughter. Their number included junior officers and soldiers who had returned from Lebanon, as well as reservists.

Israel's progressive forces, headed by the Communist Party of Israel, are carrying on their struggle in the difficult conditions of domination by the military and the unlimited power of the ruling Zionist circles. As events in Lebanon have shown, however, the trend to evaluate Israeli policy realistically is little by little making headway.

References

1. *The Middle East*, March 1983, No. 101, p. 18.
2. See *The ABC of the Palestine Problem 1896-1949*, Beirut, 1969, p. 9.
3. Quoted in: Christopher Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel*, the World Publishing Co., Cleveland and New York, 1965, pp. 10-11.
4. *The ABC of the Palestine Problem 1896-1949*, p. 9.
5. See *Report and General Statement of the Census of 1922*, Jerusalem, 1922, p. 3.
6. See *A Survey of Palestine*, Vol. I, Palestine, 1946, p. 244.

7. *The Arab East and Maghrib*, Moscow, 1977, p. 182 (in Russian).
8. *The ABC of the Palestine Problem 1896-1949*, p. 15.
9. M. Bar-Zohar, *The Armed Prophet. A Biography of Ben Gurion*, London, 1976, p. 59.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
11. Nahum Goldmann, *Où va Israël?*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris, 1975, pp. 53-54.
12. See *Israel and Palestine Political Report*, June 16, 1982, No. 91, p. 7.
13. *Foreign Policy*, No. 50, Spring 1983, p. 79.
14. *The Middle East*, July 1982, No. 93, p. 6.
15. *Foreign Policy*, No. 50, Spring 1983, p. 80.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

ZIONISM-Enemy of Peace and Social Progress

The fourth issue of the collection of articles in the series "Zionism-Enemy of Peace and Social Progress" criticises the ideology and political practice of modern Zionism, exposes the aggressive, expansionist policy of the Israeli ruling quarters in the Middle East and also the ideological subversion and propagandist actions of international Zionism. The articles written by Soviet scholars specialising in international relations and included in the present collection expose Zionism as an instrument of the most reactionary forces of imperialism adhering to anti-Soviet and anti-communist positions.